

THIS IS THE JUDGMENT OF LORD JUSTICE WARD IN THIS CASE WHICH HE GAVE IN CHAMBERS ON THE 26TH MAY 1995 BUT WHICH IS BEING HANDED DOWN IN OPEN COURT TODAY. IT CONSISTS OF 295 PAGES AND HAS BEEN SIGNED AND DATED BY THE JUDGE.

THE JUDGE HEREBY DIRECTS THAT NO TRANSCRIPT OF THE JUDGMENT NEED BE TAKEN AND THAT THE VERSION HANDED DOWN MAY BE TREATED AS AUTHENTIC.

THE JUDGMENT IS BEING DISTRIBUTED ON THE STRICT UNDERSTANDING THAT IN ANY REPORT OF IT NO PERSON (OTHER THAN COUNSEL AND THEIR INSTRUCTING SOLICITORS AND THOSE PERSONS IDENTIFIED BY NAME IN THE JUDGMENT ITSELF) MAY BE IDENTIFIED BY NAME AND THAT IN PARTICULAR THE ANONYMITY OF THE CHILD, A WARD OF COURT, AND THE MEMBERS OF HIS FAMILY MUST BE STRICTLY PRESERVED.

SIGNED:

Alan Ward.

THE RT. HON. LORD JUSTICE WARD
DATED 19TH OCTOBER 1995

Y 42 1992 IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
FAMILY DIVISION
PRINCIPAL REGISTRY IN THE MATTER OF ST (A
MINOR)
AND IN THE MATTER OF THE SUPREME COURT ACT
1991
 Lord Justice Ward

PREFACE

For reasons set out in my judgment, I have permitted the publication of this judgment in order that the media, who are aware of these proceedings, may legitimately publish matters which seem to me undoubtedly to be matters of public interest. There is, however, no legitimate public interest in the identity of the parties to these proceedings and I have accordingly granted an injunction to which reference must be made for its full terms and effect but the general tenure of which is to restrain any publication which will identify or which is calculated to lead to the identification of the child who is and will remain a ward of court or of the parties to these proceedings or of the address in Leicestershire as being the home where the child is living. In the course of the hearing I received much evidence of and affecting other children whose identity is confidential to these proceedings and must likewise not be disclosed except under the initials given to them in the judgment. I also received evidence from a number of adults some of whom have already publicly disclosed some details of the life within The family. Others have maintained their silence. As I explained to all witnesses, the evidence they gave me was confidential to the proceedings and I would respect that confidentiality. Accordingly those witnesses are also named by initial only and the identity of those witnesses is likewise protected from public disclosure unless and until that witness freely and not under pressure expressly waives that privilege. If, therefore, the media consider that there is any more to tell then I am about to unfold in a lengthy judgment, then I hope they will conduct there further enquiries discretely and responsibly and above all mindful of my injunctions which they must please respect.

The parties will find at the back of this judgment a list which may be unfolded which will identify for them the names of those who appear in the judgment under initials only. For the preparation of this schedule and for so much other work, I pay tribute to and give thanks for the industry of Mr Marcus Scott - Manderson.

JUDGMENT

I began to write this judgment on the first day of the new legal year after the service for the Judges at Westminster Abbey and with the words of the lesson read by the Lord Chancellor ringing in my ears. From Romans xiii: 10 "Love worketh no ill to his neighbour: therefore love is the fulfilling of the law." The Dean's prayer for the Judiciary was that they "may be granted the Spirit of Discernment and the Spirit of Love that they may boldly, discretely and mercifully fulfil their sacred duties, to the good of Thy people and the glory of Thy name." It all seemed so apposite, for this case is - or at least it professes to be - all about love. Love is, of course, an old, old story. "Amor omnia vincit et nos cedemas amori" - love conquers all, let us surrender ourselves to love - wrote Virgil; "Love is all you need," sang the Beatles. If the theme was timeless, so seemed this case, especially in my many moments of exasperation during the hearing and in the months it has taken to complete this judgment. It has needed the noble subject of love to expiate the ignoble distinction of being the longest wardship ever tried and I hang

my head in shame to publish the fact that this hearing lasted 75 days and that it has taken me nigh on a year to produce this judgment.

These long months have been spent trying the issues joined between the Plaintiff Mrs T., a grandmother, and the Defendant NT, her daughter, each so strongly imbued with that instinctive love for her offspring, and in grandmother's case also her offspring's offspring, that each has never flinched or contemplated surrender in this titanic struggle to secure the care and control of the much loved child in question, the Defendant's son, S. At no time has there been any issue about this young mother's ability properly to love her child and to attend to all his physical needs and the only harm from which grandmother seeks to protect him is the harm she alleges he will suffer from remaining with his mother as faithful members of what is popularly but inaccurately known as a cult, the Children of God, now known as The Family of Love or simply as The Family. This new religious movement, which is a preferable expression to "cult," was founded and led by David "Moses" Berg. They live by the Law of Love, the central principle of which is:

"Now all things are lawful to us in love, Praise God! As long as it's done in love, it keeps God's only law of love." (The writings are invariably given some emphasis which I intend not to repeat throughout this judgment save exceptionally.)"

This is another notion of love which I have had to investigate. Much time has been devoted to identifying the extent to which, if at all, sexual excesses have flowed from the freedoms conferred by the Law of Love, and the extent to which inappropriate methods of discipline and control have been imposed upon the members of the group, particularly the children, all in the name of Love on the basis commonly, if not accurately, attributed to Saint Augustine, "Ama et fac quod vis" - "Love and do what you will." The Defendant's and the group's love for their leader, "Father David" is so resolute that the Plaintiff invites me to consider whether, as Portia mused, "Love is blind and lovers cannot see the pretty follies that themselves commit".

The mother claims the inalienable right to love her God as she chooses, which is a love she submits brooks no interference from a Court of Law because she is entitled to the fundamental freedom of thought, conscience, and religion.

I feel somewhat caught in the spider's web of which the Canadian Chief Justice Lamer wrote in his Alexander Thane Lecture in Law when dealing with the difficulty Judges face in deciding issues of social policy:

"I sometimes think of these sorts of cases as being somewhat like a spider's web. If you pull on one strand of the web, the entire structure moves, but not necessarily all in the same direction. The implications are widespread and, at times, hard to foresee."

Let me now identify some of the main strands of this spider's web.

The child concerned, S, was made a Ward of Court 8 days after his birth on 10th February 1992 when his maternal grandmother issued an Originating Summons in Wardship, the Defendant to which, as I have indicated, was her daughter, NT. It was my unhappy lot to be the Applications' Judge when grandmother applied for Orders directed to the Tipstaff to seek and find S. I soon invited the Official Solicitor to act as his guardian ad litem and I am most grateful to him for invaluable assistance. The Plaintiff's has voiced her anxieties about the practices of the Children of God because the group has, over the years and on several continents, excited the attention of the police, the Courts and, inevitably, the media. Even as this case

as been progressing, there have been newspaper articles and television programmes about them. The media know about and express interest in the outcome of these proceedings. Because S is a Ward of Court, I would be entitled to give this Judgment in camera in order to preserve the confidentiality not only of my Ward and the parties but also the many witnesses who have given evidence and who were reminded and perhaps consoled by me that it would be a Contempt of Court to publish information relating to these proceedings. That is not to say that they are prohibited from telling their life's story but they are restrained from relating it with reference to these proceedings. In deciding whether to exercise the power I undoubtedly have to give judgment, or a resume of my judgment, in open Court with liberty, therefore, to publish it, I have regard to the following matters:-

- (a) The high level of rumour and speculation about the activities of the Children of God.
- (b) The proceedings that have been heard in and are still pending in other jurisdictions.
- (c) Matters of public importance touching on religious freedom and education.
- (d) The time and expense incurred in this hearing, some of it - but happily not all of it - a drain on the public purse.
- (e) The implications of this Judgment for the other parents and children within The Family in the United Kingdom and for the local authorities and education authorities in whose area they live - even though these findings are of course not binding on any of them.

In the light of those considerations, I conclude that the public interest is best served by this Judgment being delivered in Open Court, subject, however, and the media must please take note, to restrictions I have placed by way of injunction of general application to restrain any publicity which identifies my Ward or the parties to this dispute or even the identity of children and of the witnesses who gave evidence - all of whom are referred by initials - unless they expressly waive the privilege of anonymity. Furthermore, I am satisfied that the effect of the media descending upon the home in which the child lives - "doorstepping" is, I believe, the colloquialism for this journalistic technique - will be grievously upsetting to the members of the community in which my Ward lives, and will accordingly upset and cause harm to my Ward. The group see that as "persecution" and I agree that "doorstepping" would be exactly that. I very much hope the media will not find it necessary to intrude. The leaders of the community have expressed their willingness to make arrangements for a news conference and I welcome that but I repeat that the anonymity of the parties, the child and the witnesses must be respected. There is surely enough of a story in, and the public interest must be sufficiently satisfied by reporting the facts I am about to set out.

THE PARTIES

I ask the media please to respect the privacy of the parties who in wardship proceedings ordinarily would not suffer delicate details of domestic differences being disclosed to the general public and I invite, and having invited, I expect the media to be discreet in their reporting of this part of the Judgment.

The Plaintiff is a lady some 58 years of age. She married in 1966 and two children were born of the marriage, NT who is not far short of her 28th birthday and CT who will soon be 26. Both sides of the family seemed comfortably placed and they lived an easy life in Kenya. When NT was about 10 she was sent to boarding school in England, as was CT in due time.

It was a conventional step to take, one which I am sure was genuinely believed by both parents to be in the children's interest, but the separation of these young children from their parents and the deep unhappiness it caused them, has an ironic edge to it considered against certain Family practices I have heard so much about. This marriage was not a happy one. The Plaintiff and her husband separated in 1981 and were divorced in 1982. It was an acrimonious, bitter divorce which took its toll upon the Plaintiff and no doubt on all the other members of the family and they all still seem to suffer. In 1983 the Plaintiff's stepfather died. He was a wealthy man who set up a series of Trust Funds from which the Plaintiff and her children, among others, have benefited. Each of them has a substantial private income which has taken them way outside the Legal Aid limit. For a long time both mother and daughter were represented by solicitors with Leading Counsel and Junior Counsel. By October last the Plaintiff had already been forced to dispense with Leading Counsel and the Defendant's Leader availed of the opportunity to make legal submissions to me in the course of that long directions appointment and I gave a separate Judgment, which may now be reported, when I refused to discharge the Wardship. When this hearing began in January 1994, the Plaintiff had to appear in person. I gave leave that she might be assisted by Miss Jenny Kent, who conveniently has knowledge of the case having worked on it as the pupil of Counsel who had been acting for the Plaintiff. Miss Kent who has had perforce to serve much of her pupillage having effective conduct of this case, not with right of audience but only as the "McKenzie friend." The first time she rose to her feet as a fully fledged barrister was to make the closing submissions on the Plaintiff's behalf. What an ordeal. But how well she did it! She won my unreserved admiration for a most polished maiden speech.

It had seemed that the Defendant would also run out of money and appear in person. Mr Richard Barton, not greatly senior to Miss Kent, had some earlier knowledge of the case as the Chambers' Devil, and appeared on the first day of the hearing applying unsuccessfully on behalf of other members of the community to be joined as parties. He was, however, retained by the mother. He was immediately thrown in the deep end, given precious little time to prepare but he has kept his head above the water - and at times below the parapet - in a way which has also won my admiration. Tributes to Counsel would not be complete without my acknowledging the great help I have received from Miss Pamela Scriven QC and Mr Marcus Scott-Manderson ably and fully instructed by the Official Solicitor. Mr Roderick Wood QC breezed in grandly at the end to make an erudite contribution on the law as *amicus curiae*, having the assistance of notes mainly made by Miss Rachel Platt, at least until she went off to get married!

I have interrupted the story. NT had an unhappy and a troubled time at school and did herself little credit until her third year. She then settled and showed her mettle. It was difficult for her because she was witness to the parental arguments during her school holidays, conscious of her father's infidelity and deeply upset by these troubles at home. At 16 she was caught smoking and was expelled. Grandmother, naturally protective of her daughter, was more angry with the headmistress than with NT.

CT was no more happy. His misfortune was to witness a master at his preparatory school indecently assaulting a friend. He knows, and his sister knows, what a searing and abusive experience that was not only for the victim but for the observer. That knowledge should have induced some sympathy for some

the witnesses called by the Plaintiff but the connection did not seem to be made despite my prompting. The Plaintiff's response on learning of this indecency was wholly predictable: she removed CT at once. Again the parallel with this case is not acknowledged by either of her children. In due time he went on to public school and then to art school. He, too, was unsettled by his life's experiences and was without purpose or direction.

His father had not set him a good example. He is a man of great charm but his lifestyle has defied the convention of his class, upbringing, and military service. He remained in Kenya after the divorce living in a "camp" with a girlfriend. I have the impression of a fairly lax, free and easy mode of life but the detail does not matter at all. He is too much of a roué to be a good really father, but as he gave evidence, I warmed to him more than I had thought likely. It is not at all surprising to hear NT declare that she was much closer to her father than to her mother, nor is it a surprise to me that CT felt more comfortable with his mother than with his father. It is sufficient for this judgment to express the finding that each of these parents, so utterly different in temperament and outlook, established enduring attachments with each of the children. In particular I find that no matter how frequently over the years mother and daughter clashed and opposed each other in the manner of like poles in the magnetic field, they have loved each other with a strength which has survived despite NT's protestations of a present deep antipathy and hostility which she has even described as hatred for her mother because of the action taken by her mother in these proceedings.

1986 was another unhappy year for the family. The strain of the matrimonial difficulties, the struggle to keep the house for the family and to preserve some security for them took its toll upon the Plaintiff who suffered a deep depression and made a serious attempt upon her life. NT having obtained her qualification in business studies, found her employment as a temporary typist singularly unfulfilling and she returned to Kenya where things were no better. "Everyone", she said, "seemed to live rather shallow lives dominated by sex and drugs." The Plaintiff may rue the day she suggested to NT that they attend a meditation course. Father and his girlfriend joined in. It did not appeal to the Plaintiff but it had a very great attraction for her former husband who became an acolyte of a Gurumayi to whose Ashram he retreated for instruction. His 21st birthday present to NT was a holiday in India to join him near Bombay. She went. She stayed, but it did not seem to be exactly her cup of tea. Nepal beckoned. Her modest resorting to drugs gave her respite from the emptiness of her existence. It was an emptiness just waiting to be filled. Little imagination is needed to complete the rest of the story. Members of the Children of God were laudably engaged in their ministry to spread the gospel of Christ along the hippy trail to Katmandu. They invited NT to pray that the Holy Spirit might come into her life. Deeply sceptical if not also forthrightly hostile to the idea that Christianity offered any salvation, she nonetheless joined in prayer. The prayer was answered. She was reborn. She forsook all and joined the group.

This laconic account is not intended to conceal how momentous an event this was - and is - in the life of this young lady, nor do I wish to denigrate the similar occasion for other members of the group or for so many others of different persuasions who have experienced the cataclysmic joy of becoming what is sometimes disparagingly called "reborn Christians". The change in their life is the obvious evidence of their conversion but the light in their eye is more compelling testimony of the power that drives them onwards. For those, like

this Plaintiff, who do not follow suit, the change is often totally perplexing and incomprehensible.

Meanwhile CT had returned to Kenya and sought his solace in heroin. In the summer of 1988 he travelled to India to visit NT whom he found to be a much changed and improved person. At the instigation of The Family, he, too, accepted Jesus into his heart.

The Plaintiff and her children corresponded on affectionate terms, NT showing more affection than had been her wont. She returned to London early in 1989. She and her mother met with some regularity. Some time in about 1990 NT took her mother to a house in North London and the Plaintiff had the distinct feeling that the house was on show to outsiders. NT did not disclose that she lived elsewhere. In July 1991 NT accompanied by a member of the group visited her mother and told her she was pregnant. Again she was not frank as to where she was living. Shortly afterwards the Plaintiff learnt that the group whom NT had described as being "Heaven's Magic", was in fact the Children of God. What she learnt about them from disaffected former members filled her with absolute horror.

At a meeting at her home arranged in August 1992, the Plaintiff introduced NT to former members with close links to so called anti-cult organisations. The daughter of one of them, NT, a young teenager 15 years of age, spoke of her unhappy experiences and later repeated them to me in evidence. NT was unimpressed. The relationship between mother and daughter was fractured and so far there has been little time of healing.

CT had travelled with The Family to Thailand and cancelled his mother's proposed visit to him for fear that she, with the assistance of the anti-cult organisations, would kidnap him and 'de-programme' him against the contamination of his 'brain-washing' by David 'Moses' Berg and his followers. These events have assumed enormous significance in the minds of NT and CT. Of course they are right to believe that their mother was intent upon persuading them to leave their group but I am totally satisfied that she did not plan any kidnapping or anything of the kind and no sinister plot for 'de-programming' existed at all.

On 13 December 1991 NT telephoned her mother to say she would contact her when the baby had been born. She wrote saying that she did not wish her mother to be in England for the birth. In fact NT, fearing her abduction, went to Scotland where S was born on 10 February 1992. It is not insignificant as a pointer to the true relationship which exists between mother and daughter that NT confided the fact of S's birth to her mother, not to her father. It is also noteworthy how involved the plaintiff was in these events in contrast with the new grandfather who knew nothing of the birth of his grandson until that information was conveyed to him a month later at a cocktail party.

The Wardship proceedings were started. The information placed before me led my taking the most unusual step of ordering that if S were found by the Tipstaff he should be removed from his mother and placed in the interim care of his grandmother until I could deal further with the matter. It was an unfortunate consequence of that order that the police attended, as agents for the Tipstaff, at a home where the Defendant had been living in Essex and that 'raid' naturally caused fear and alarm to the adults and especially the children, who lived in that community. I regret that it happened and with hindsight I regret making that order. After various attempts had been made to enforce the order, NT made contact with solicitors in a way which satisfied me I could trust her to remain within the jurisdiction whilst these serious matters were investigated. I discharged the order giving care and control to grandmother and placed my trust in NT to look after her child and to keep him

ere. My trust in her has been repaid not least to the extent that I can be satisfied that S has been well cared for and has grown into a delightful little boy. To be fair to the plaintiff, I should also emphasize that it is has always been her case that NT has all the qualities of a good mother and the plaintiff's only complaint about NT is her continuing membership of The Family.

THE CHILDREN OF GOD

Their founder and their leader was David Berg. He was born in February 1919 in California of parents both of whom were Evangelists. In his teenage years, he spent much time travelling with his mother as she fulfilled her pastoral and preaching duties. His mother seems to have been a powerful influence on his life. He was drafted into the army but invalided out after a severe attack of double pneumonia which took him so close to death's door that he vowed to serve the Lord if he were spared. He has honoured his promise. He married in 1943. He had four children, Deborah, a disaffected member and now an arch enemy of the group. His second child was Aaron who died in a climbing accident leaving a daughter MB. Hosea and Faithy remain loyal to the group.

In about 1953 Berg and one Fred Jordan, a well known Evangelist of the time, travelled the United States preaching and witnessing on a person to person basis. They pioneered television evangelism. They parted company in 1965. In 1966 Berg, then "Uncle Dave", established "Teens for Christ" and in 1968, a ministry for hippies in Huntington Beach near Los Angeles. Young people, students and even graduates, drop-outs and hippies were attracted to him. He was powerfully charismatic. As the young flock to him, parents began to rumble with discontent. As the group staged public demonstrations to condemn the evils of American society, they attracted the attention of the press. In 1969, a journalist dubbed them 'The Children of God' and the name stuck. The group travelled through the United States and Canada in caravans and during this period Berg became known as "Moses". He travelled abroad in 1970 and began to write his "Mo letters." The group was expanding rapidly as more and more young adults, often from prosperous homes but varying religious backgrounds, joined the communal life which was in such stark political contrast with the individualism of middle class American society. Relationships with established pentecostal and evangelical churches were fractured. The movement had become revolutionary and they proclaimed themselves as such. In 1970 Berg received what became known as the 'All Things' revelation which was based largely on the scripture, 'All things are lawful unto us' (1 Cor. 6:12). 'All Things' meant exactly what it said and out of this evolved the fundamental article of faith that all things, including, notoriously, the enjoyment of sexual freedom, were lawful to those who were motivated by love.

In its early practical application this freedom was granted so that a member, who was required to go on an outreach team to open up a new community, leaving his wife behind, might have his sexual needs satisfied by one of the other woman going on that expedition. At first the freedoms were granted only to the leaders at the Texas Soul Clinic who enjoyed the practice known as sharing, i.e. the free sharing of sexual favours, which favours were to be bestowed sacrificially, unselfishly and in love to meet the desperate need of whomsoever sought that favour. As leaders left the TSC to establish their own communities they took the liberties with them and misused them. Berg made proper attempts to rein in these excesses.

The movement was growing rapidly. What had begun with one home for about 50 members in Huntington Beach in

1968 had grown to about 300 in 1970, 1500 in 1971 and by 1973 there were 2244 members in 180 homes. The sexual revolution continued to be promoted as Berg challenged the restrictive attitudes towards sex fostered by many churches and still held by many of his members. A number of important letters, known as "Mo Letters", were written in this period. "Moses" was a name taken by Berg perhaps because Moses was both pastor and prophet. Others in the group assumed biblical names. Of these letters, 'The Art of Oh' and 'Mountain Maid' extolled the wonders of love, sex and the beauties of the female form; 'Revolutionary Women' informed the reader that sexual attraction was natural and God-given and in 'Come on Ma! - Burn your Bra,' nudity was encouraged. In 'Revolutionary Sex' no sexual activity, except sodomy, was to be regarded as sinful. In 'One Wife' the theme that sexual relations outside of monogamous marriage could be permissible, was such a revolutionary view, except to the leaders accustomed to sharing, that most of the flock failed to see the message.

Late in 1973 while living in London, Berg and his so-called "second wife", Maria came across lonely members of their dance club and began using her sexual charms - and sexual intercourse - as a means of witnessing to and showing them a tangible sample and proof of the sacrificial love of God. This became a major but infamous ministry. A series of letters encouraged the women - and the men - to engage in 'Flirty Fishing', and become "hookers of men for Christ."

The organization of the Children of God was in the hands of a World Council of Ministers appointed by Berg but mainly drawn from his family. There was a structure of ministers, bishops, regional shepherds, district shepherds and finally colony shepherds. The original big 'blobs' were broken down into smaller colonies and each colony tithed 10% of its income derived from the sale of its pamphlets and posters and - not unimportantly - the 10% of the monies received in consideration for the Flirty Fishing activities in which so many of the women had become engaged. By 1978 there was a strong feeling that some of the leaders were using the colonies' income to support their own private life-style, forcing the ordinary members into more penurious circumstances. Berg struck. The leaders were dismissed. In the RNR, the Re-organisation Nationalisation Revolution letter, Berg took over as 'a one-man band dictatorship' with supervision for the local homes coming "straight from the top, primarily direct through the letters, with exactly what to do and what not to do." The dismissal of the leaders had two important consequences. Firstly the deposed Jethro and Deborah Davis became the focus of a growing campaign against the Children of God. Secondly without direct leadership, many homes broke up and the members dispersed even though they still continued to receive the Mo letters.

In April 1981 Berg began the "Fellowship Revolution", reconstituting the homes under the name 'Family of Love' since shortened to 'The Family'. There has been much semantic posturing, much muddying the waters, and much waste of time over the issue of whether or not the Children of God still exist. These diversionary tactics were deployed to obfuscate the real issue which is whether or not the current leadership are responsible for what happened during the period up to the RNR, during the interregnum until the Fellowship Revolution in 1981 and for the organisation since then. I am totally satisfied that there was a continuous line of top leadership with David Berg and Maria at the helm regulating the affairs of the group which despite changes of name and shape, remained one and the same. The Mo letters relevant in the early days of the Children of God remained as relevant after the RNR and they continue to be

relevant today. The name may have changed; various echelons of the leadership chain may have altered; but the command remained with Berg, Maria, and his inner cabinet. I find that it was a disingenuous attempt to distance them from their responsibility both for what is and for what was. This abject failure to acknowledge responsibility has diminished the trust I feel able to place in the leaders of the organisation.

Until recently, the leadership structure had Berg at its head. He died in November 1994, after the conclusion of the evidence. Maria, who for some years has gradually been assuming much greater prominence and who has been groomed as his successor, probably is now in charge. Berg and Maria were served by 'World Services' (WS), the administrative branch of which has Peter Amsterdam and Gary as the senior personnel. The American, Pacific and European Central Reporting Organisations, the CROs, report to W.S. Josiah (Paul Pelloquin) heads EUCRO (the European Organisation) in "team work" with Dawn Gilligan, Philip and Galileo, and with Lisa having succeeded Mary Mom as head of the "childcare team work." They preside over "national shepherds", SPM, being the national shepherd for the British Isles. There is an established team work for childcare in the British Isles and that has been assigned to Heidi, SPM's wife and to J.L. Beneath SPM are various district shepherds, local area shepherds and home shepherds. They all work "in team work" and the teams are elected by the members over 16 years old voting by secret ballot. The purpose of 'team work' is to spread the burden and responsibility of decision making and to provide checks and balances against abuse.

Another branch of the main administrative organisation is the "Creations Department", which disseminates the group's publications. This department is headed by Apollos (Michael Gilligan) and Pathway who report directly to Maria. I know little about the financial management and have some evidence that the organisation has acquired considerable wealth through Flirty Fishing, through its publications and recently through its expanding video ministry. The ordinary homes are kept in anything but the lap of luxury. Though it is not material for me to make findings about The Family's wealth, I am quite satisfied that within the homes in this country, there is no surplus of money and the members, including their shepherds, live communally to a physical standard of comfort which might be perfectly satisfactory and meet the welfare of the children within the group but it is by no means lavish.

The present membership of The Family is approximately 12,000 in homes spread across the globe. Berg and Maria withdrew from the world sometime in about 1970 and their whereabouts and the whereabouts of World Services and Creations is a closely guarded secret to which I have not been made privy. SPM has, however, revealed to me the addresses of the several homes in England and Wales which addresses shall not be disclosed without my permission. There are 194 children below 16 years of age and 101 members 16 years and older in the British Isles. That SPM should vouchsafe this information to me is to his credit and I take it into account in his favour when assessing the degree to which he can be trusted by the court.

There are various categories of membership. The full members have access to all the literature much of which is marked DO for "Disciples Only". The new disciples are the 'babes' who for a number of months are denied the "strong meat" of the Mo letters. Catacombers are on their way into the group and have restricted access to the literature being allowed "the milk" but not the 'strong meat' which has included some of the more salacious sexual material. DFers do not wish to become missionaries but desire some fellowship with the family and

receive a restricted category of literature and known as the "Daily Food". Another publication, "Love is News" is available for another category of supporter known as the LINers. Kings, supporters and provisioning contacts donate money and provisions. In 1089 The Family introduced the Turf-Supporter Programme. The TSers are members who were at one time full disciples but no longer live in a Family home. They no longer receive the DO literature but receive DFO material ("Disciples and Friends") as well as GP ("General Public") publications. Mr Barton submits, I find persuasively, that the fact that The Family have encouraged this "pressure valve" to allow those not able to make the necessary commitment to remain in some fellowship with the main body is compelling evidence that this is not a pernicious cult.

THE ANTI-CULT MOVEMENT

Not all who leave The Family show intense hostility to them. Of course some are embittered by their experiences but others feel nostalgia and affection for the good aspects of life in the community. The expert evidence satisfies me that the majority look back more in sorrow than in anger. On the other hand, there is a vociferous minority who, no doubt with good cause, are deeply antagonistic. Many are involved in or used by the anti-cult organisations. I have become acutely aware of the violent, almost paranoid, mutual hostility and fear between some of these organisations and The Family. Because of the passions aroused, I have been on guard against attempts to deceive me by distortion and exaggeration of the truth. I am alive to the possibility that there has been a cross-fertilisation of the evidence so that hearsay evidence has been falsely dressed up in the guise of personal experience. It is plain that the Plaintiff has had the support of the anti-cult movement in procuring a considerable body of the documentary evidence which has been placed before me. At the end of the day there is very little live challenge to the authenticity of that evidence even if the manner in which it was obtained is open to question. The suggestion is made on behalf of The Family that the Plaintiff is a mere tool and dupe of the anti-cult movement. I reject that submission. She is a remarkably strong and determined lady who, having embarked upon this campaign has carried it through when many lesser individuals would have folded under the strain. NT is no less obdurate and her love/hate relationship with her mother is a demonstration of the observation I make that whilst there is much about both of these ladies which commands my admiration and my respect, each of them in their way and particularly in their dealings with each other, can be jolly difficult!

THE JOINDER OF ISSUE

As I have already made clear there is not and there never has been any attack at all upon NT's ability to provide proper physical care and to give all proper love and affection to her son. If the child is to be removed from her care, it is only because of her adherence to The Family and because the practices of The Family are harmful to this child. The issues have changed form and substance since the inception of the proceedings. The initial complaints were of sexual improprieties and brain-washing. Happily I was able to contain the latter issue and eventually remove it altogether from the forensic arena, no doubt to the dismay to the anti-cult movement and perhaps to the plethora of experts who would have placed their great learning before me but left me not much the wiser for it.

As more information came to light the scope of the enquiry expanded into issues of education, medical neglect,

isolation both from the outside world and from members of the natural family. Still later and indeed even as the evidence was unfolding, the spotlight turned to the methods of control, physical and emotional, deployed by The Family on the errant members, adult and child.

I refused an application by several members of the home in which NT lives to be joined as individual parties because they considered my decision might impinge upon their children. The Family as an entity of its own is not a party. I feel in no way precluded from making findings of fact about The Family, their creed and their practice for I am quite satisfied that NT and they have had every opportunity to lay before me whatever evidence they would have wished. The reality is that to all intents and purposes they have controlled the litigation. The recent literature is littered with examples of the keen involvement of Berg, Maria and World Services in all aspects of this litigation. SPM has sworn 11 affidavits and answered interrogatories on oath. I have over 250 pages of written testimony from him and the material exhibited to his affidavits runs to some 500 pages. His last affidavit placed before me a letter from Peter Amsterdam with numerous annexures and Peter Amsterdam writes that "Senior leadership, including Father David, have read, made additions to and agreed with all of this material." I made it abundantly plain that I would have derived great help from hearing Peter Amsterdam whose unsworn testimony does not carry great weight, being in the nature of hearsay evidence untested by cross-examination. He was offered every opportunity to come to give evidence and be cross-examined and I assured him every protection should he have done so. He declined. It was an unwise decision for he must have known the importance of a senior member of The Family attending to allay my fears and to set the record straight. He surely appreciated that he laid himself open to legitimate fair comment that he must have something to hide. It is equally noteworthy that the leaders on the EUCRO teamwork and childcare Heidi were conspicuous by their absence.

I have taken a long time to prepare this judgment and I am embarrassed and extremely sorry for the delay. I felt it necessary to read and re-read the evidence with an open mind uncontaminated by the lurid features of The Family's past. There are more than 10,000 pages of often closely typed written evidence, about 6000 pages of which were introduced in random order during the course of the hearing. I have looked back carefully over over 2000 pages of my own notes of the oral evidence. The written arguments submitted by all counsel were lengthy but invaluable. That all took time but it was an essential task. I confess I have not found the reading or the deciding easy. I knew the case would be difficult from the moment it started. I only reached a clear conclusion after completing this re-reading during the long vacation. I am very grateful to the President of the Family Division - and to the Clerk of the Rules - for giving me some time off but it was not enough for me to complete the task. Ordinary judicial duties in London, on circuit and in the Court of Appeal eat into spare time. Since hardly a page of this judgment is drawn from any one source, I have had to have constant access to 15 notebooks and 25 various ring-binders of evidence, submissions and notes. So it was hardly possible to dash off a sentence here and there!

The order in which I have approached my task is to remind myself of the basic theme of the law, to identify the issues in dispute, make findings of fact of matters past and present, assess future risks, and, having directed myself more fully as to the law, to reach a conclusion.

THE BASIC LAW

My duty is clear. Section 1(1) of the Children Act 1989 prescribes:-

"When a Court determines any question with respect to the upbringing of a child ... the child's welfare shall be the Court's paramount consideration."

Among the circumstances to which I am required to have regard by virtue of Section 1(3) of the Act are whether the child is at risk of suffering any harm and how capable not only his parents, but any other person in relation to whom the Court considers the question to be relevant is of meeting the child's physical, emotional and educational needs.

The mother wishes to continue to live within the group with the result that the child will come into contact with and will from time to time be in the care of other members of the group who will come and go. In order to assess the risk of harm to this boy I have to assess the risk of harm to a child being brought up within the Family. To assess the risk of future harm, I must first make findings of fact as to any harm which has in the past befallen children living in the Family. The law is clear that all matters of fact must be established on a balance of probabilities but the more serious the allegation the more convincing is the evidence needed to tip the balance in respect of it: See *Re M* (1994) 1FLR 67, *Re W* (1994) 1 FLR, and most recently *Re H & R*, Court of Appeal 14th December 1994. When assessing the risk of future harm I need to be satisfied that there is a real and substantial risk of harm, not a fanciful speculative risk. See *H v H (Minor) (Child Abuse:)* (1990) Fam 86.

THE DISPUTED ISSUES

I categorise them under these headings:-

- (1) An assessment of the Family
- (2) Sexually inappropriate conduct
- (3) Medical neglect
- (4) Impairment of educational development
- (5) Impairment of emotional, social or behavioural development
- (6) Physical ill-treatment.
- (7) Changes made and likely to be made.

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE FAMILY

I have had perforce to look back over 25 years of The Family's history. I have already given an outline of its development and its structure. It is necessary to look a little more closely at some of those matters for I must not fall into the trap of attributing collective responsibility to The Family as a group when the faults and failings are those of an individual or individuals or even a commune or more than one commune. I have not been given information as to the number of people who have been members of The Family during these past 25 years but since there are about 12,000 current disciples, many, many thousands of many different nationalities must have belonged to the movement over the years. They have lived in communities large and small and in countries near and far. It is, therefore, necessary for me to concentrate on:-

- (a) how control was exercised by the leadership;
- (b) how loyal and obedient the flock were;
- (c) what their view of the outside world was and to what extent they sensed persecution;
- (d) Whether they were prepared to deceive.

CONTROL

As I have already indicated, by 1975 the main world headquarters were in London with missionary colonies

established throughout the world. Each area was represented in London by an "Ambassador" who received reports from the home areas on their missionary activities. They were, however, isolated from that home base and the organisation was top heavy. The "New Revolution" created smaller colonies and a more closely involved role for leaders working in a "chain of cooperation". It had broken down by 1978 when Berg declared the RNR and sacked the leaders. He, with his inner cabinet, was in sole control. "Visiting servants" visited the homes to advise and encourage but they had little or no authority. Following the mass suicide at Jonestown, huge media interest inevitably turned against any cult and the already infamous Children of God dropped their name as they entered another revolution, this time the Nationalised Reorganised Security-wise Revolution which had the practical effect of dispersing many of the members back to their home country. The Family of Love was born out of this. The Fellowship Revolution followed in April 1981 creating the present day structure, with a pyramid of leadership this time elected by the members rather than imposed from above. They kept in touch by home meeting home with local area fellowship meetings and national area fellowship meetings. That, more or less, remains the position today. There is, therefore, some force in the point that for a period between February 1978 and April 1981 the leadership's control was lax, and in places may have been non-existent and members were therefore much more at liberty to follow their own devices - and desires!

That, however, is not the whole truth. All disciples kept in touch with Berg through his Mo letters. The RNR declared:-
 "22. We think the colonies can do better on their own under our direct personal supervision straight from the top! I think the letters are going to be the leaders and will be obeyed better if they don't have any upper officers interfering.

34. Then we can directly supervise your local homes straight from the top, primarily directly through the letters with exactly what to do and what not to do".

THE MO LETTERS

The unknown author of a document "Understanding and Interpreting Father David's Letters" tells me that:

"Father David's more radical articles could be likened unto cayenne pepper. Used properly, they add a distinctive flavour, but they are not intended as a main course." I am not consoled. Having been looking at Mo letters over the past 21/2 years and in particular in the past months of preparation of this Judgment, I fear my digestive system will never recover. Mo likes to use them to:

"shock people, challenge them, stir them up, arouse them, awaken them out of their lethargy, even" - he must have me in mind - "cause them to explode over something I have said, at least get them to do something to spur them into action one way or another."

Some of his letters are indeed truly shocking. Some are blasphemous and obscene. By way of tiny example:-
 "A Penis? or a Sword!" July 1976 (now thankfully withdrawn from circulation)

"God enjoys fucking you with his word, just like I am enjoying it right now! I am fucking you (Maria) with the word of God, and I enjoy it because you are receiving it."
 "My childhood sex" (June '77 and August '78) - an authoritative letter according to The Family's expert witness -

"I can remember at the age of 4 I was very very interested in little girls and what they looked like down there. I wanted to examine them, and most of them seemed to like having me examine them, if you could get away with it when no

adults were around, and play doctor and nurse. (SARA: That proves how sexy the holy spirit really is! Because you were filled with the Holy Spirit from your mother's womb, yet as far back as you can remember you were always interested in girls and sex) Fascinated! and why not? Sex is a creation of God, created for us all to enjoy, even children!"

I must deal with the sexual aspect in more detail later and for the moment concentrate on the reference to the sexy Holy Spirit. This takes on a different significance as soon as one looks at "The Goddess of Love" letter. It has a drawing of the Holy Trinity. The Holy Spirit is drawn as a voluptuous lady naked save for the string of beads and two hearts covering her nipples and a string of beads around her waist with a heart covering her genital area. She is lying on her heavenly bed her arms outstretched to receive her man, her legs drawn up and wide open ready for sexual intercourse and the commentary explains

"So why not picture God's love, His Spirit as a real person? which She is!." The words attributed to her are "Come! I am out of this world! Receive me !I am God's love! His Queen of love! You need me! Take me! I'm yours! Take me! I am your love gift from God! I am all yours for the asking!"
 It is the most revolting drawing.

I need not dwell long upon such passages as appear in "Afflictions", November 1976, since withdrawn, where reference is made to Christ suffering venereal disease from his sexual contact with Mary Magdalene and other known prostitutes.

Many would find these writings blasphemous, which is strictly not a matter for me to decide. It is, however, appropriate for me to make the finding that some of the material is highly offensive to right thinking members of society.

It is essential but difficult in a case like this to retain a proper sense of proportion. I am told, and I am prepared to accept that letters on sex, nudity and FFing comprise only 15% of his literary outpouring, that far the greater proportion of his letters deals with inspirational themes and bible studies, the End Time, heaven and eschatology. He wrote on current events, politics and economics, on the administration of the organisation, on outreach and witnessing, on childcare and Family life. That material ranges from the profound to the banal. Of course, therefore, the letters vary in impact, importance and application. What has to be determined in this Court is how the disciples understood and applied the letters on sex, discipline, education etc.

GROUP LOYALTY AND OBEDIENCE: MO - THE END TIME PROPHET.

Father David had two roles in The Family, one as its administrative head and the other as its spiritual leader. Age and failing health, and possibly other factors, gradually reduced his administrative duties. He changed from friendly Uncle Dave to stern but loving Father David and then Grandpa. That notwithstanding, as Peter Amsterdam wrote to me in May 1994, his "role as spiritual leader has remained constant". He said:

"The Family holds Father David to be a prophet of God. It is part of our religious belief that Father David often "speaks by divine inspiration". He is a "person gifted with profound moral insight and exceptional powers of expression," and is a "predictor". He is also "the chief spokesperson of a movement or cause." We also believe that he is inspired in his "forth telling". By both our sincerely held religious beliefs and a definition of the word we rightly consider Father David a prophet".

"We revere and love him because of the profound effect he has had upon our lives, and we credit him with having created

an organisation that allows us to live our religious faith and to accomplish what we feel is a great deal for the Lord."

Those sentiments have been echoed time after time in the evidence to which I have listened. His disciples did revere and love him. He is, said the expert Doctor Susan Palmer, an icon. To the faithful members he is a godly person. Some of the Plaintiff's witnesses who have now left the movement, though they are still supportive of their friends who are in it, were less flattering and I recall SD, whose evidence was refreshingly candid, telling me, with all the innocence of youth, that:

"He's a nice guy who has dedicated his life to help others to reach a goal in life but he is a few straws short of a bale."

What is significant for the purpose of this Judgment is my clear finding that this mother loves him and venerates him and so do the national shepherds and the home shepherds and such is that unquestioning devotion that they cannot bring themselves to contemplate any ill of him. Their loyalty is total.

Amsterdam explained it:

"To understand Family members' reluctance to speak disparagingly of Father David, one must bear in mind that Family members love him and are deeply appreciative of the extremely salutary effect he and his ministry have had on their lives....Although most people respect and love their fathers, in most cases they will admit their fathers are flawed individuals and not above criticism. Some may even openly voice that criticism amongst members of their own family. Nevertheless, most family members would naturally come to their father's defence and close ranks with other family members should that same criticism or worse originate from an outsider. I believe this is the position adopted by those Family members who have testified in these proceedings."

OBEDIENCE, CRITICISM AND "MURMURING"

The members of The Family live communally. Communal life breaks down unless its members accept a large measure of discipline and refrain from carping criticism because it is destructive. I understand that. Every institution needs its rules and regulations and depends upon the members' compliance be it at school, in the army or in a learned profession. So it is with The Family. The army metaphor is not uncommon in their writings, e.g. in July 1989 Berg was writing:

"We are a very select army, we are God's crack troops. We are the tough uncompromising insistent members of Christianity who refuse to compromise! We are strictly loyal to our leader Jesus Christ and our officers! We are willing to obey tough rules and undertake tough assignments." When facing the need to tighten up The Family in July 1989 and listing the various offences and sins for which the guilty parties might even be excommunicated he included:-

2. "Unbelief in the letters. People who are ashamed of what we believe and ashamed of what I write ought not to be in this army, they ought not to be with us! If you want to be part of this man's army, you had better believe what I have to say and what I have said and what God has given me and shown me; or for God's sake, get out."

3. Critical of Dad, Family or the letters. We don't believe in supporting people who don't support us and our works and our ways.

4. Murmurers, troublemakers and bad apples. Excommunicate them.

5. Weak sisters and brothers who poisoned the minds and hearts and spirits of others ... get rid of them.

6. Failure to obey Family rules: people who don't obey, people who ignore the Letters, who ignore all my extensive counsel and advice on security, they don't even belong in The Family! Give me obedience and absolute adherence to the rules of The Family or get them out!

7. Failure to obey leadership: insubordination and rebellion against leadership cannot be countenanced in any man's army. ... If people don't obey and don't do what they are told to do and don't follow the Letters and disregard leadership and disrespect all the laws and rules, they are not one of us! We can't have disobedient rebellious wilful stubborn soldiers who can't take orders and even follow suggestions, not in this man's army." This reference to a suggestion confirms evidence I received that "a suggestion is an order in love." In order fully to understand the significance of this document I must point out now that offence 14 is "sex with minors" and offence 17 is "excessive reading of worldly books, magazines....spiritual junk food."

In October 1991 (GN 482) Dad blasted a young man Tony or Zack Attack. The letter is called "Grumblers Get Out" and that is the strong message of the communication. A month later in GN 485 excommunicable offences were divided into those which were "spiritually polluting problems", namely a chronic murmuring and voicing doubts; those which were "physically polluting problems" which are (a) sodomy and (b) sex with outsiders and thirdly "security risks" which were (a) taking illegal drugs (b) having sex with minors (c) repeatedly yelling and going into angry rages and (d) giving DO literature to outsiders.

THE ROLE OF THE MO LETTERS

SPM produced for me Creations' advice to The Family! lawyers who have been "blown away by a sudden dose of Mo letter shock". That document points to the need "rightly to divide the word" and not to give every letter literal interpretation. It must be obvious that the threat of excommunication for failure to obey a Mo letter is hardly likely to apply when the subject of the Mo letter is "how to clean a swimming pool" or even when the stricture is against being longer than three minutes on the telephone or using more than three pieces of toilet paper! In interpreting the letters it is, therefore, necessary to bear in mind the intended shock treatment because as Berg writes,

"I'm an extremist, a radical, a fanatic, and in order to pull some people half way, you have got to go all the way in the opposite direction! Then you pull some of the people too far and you've got to go to the opposite extreme, the other way, to try to get some of the extremists back on centre again! Till finally, like a pendulum, you sort of get to where you are more in the middle and more on centre than the opposite extreme".

This letter written in January 1982 is an echo of the "shock treatment" letter he wrote in March 1971. I shall assume, therefore, that he was well aware of this pendulum effect, and that he intended to bring it about when he wrote the letters, about which more later, conferring sexual freedoms upon the former hippy members who had forsaken sex or the straight-laced members who had grown up in a strict Evangelical tradition where sex was regarded as "dirty". The document "Understanding and Interpreting Father David's Letters" informs me that they are "a continually expanding collection of writings and are intended to be read and understood in context, as a body". I shall, therefore, endeavour to follow the instruction and look at the collection of letters on sexual freedom in the context of the whole philosophy they were expounding. I will bear in mind some are just:

"fun and entertaining, some informative, some

mysterious, some practical instructions, some prophetic, some correctional, some are personal commentary, speculation or opinion, some are meant for the moment, others are eternal, some are divine, and others are just Dad".

In his letter "Bearing False Witness" Berg acknowledged that he "could be wrong when it's only my personal opinion and it's not the word of God... Unless I say, "God said it!", I could be wrong." I must assume he had that in mind when he wrote "God's Only Law is Love", July 29th 1977, because that letter is about "what the Bible says about true free love." At the end of the day, however, I must accept, and the evidence laid before me confirms that I should accept that any "application of counsel contained in the Mo letters is a matter of personal faith and conscience." Nevertheless in judging the extent to which ordinary members are free to act according to their faith or to listen to their conscience, I must assess the extent to which the letters have fortified that faith and shaped the individuals conscience.

In that regard I note a consistent thread from the following letters:-

(a) January 1978 the RNR letter.

"We have heard of quite a few instances where leaders have changed the meaning of my letters by their actions or verbal interpretation. My letters mean exactly what they say, literally, and they don't need explaining away, spiritualising or re-interpreting by anyone!"

"The letters are going to be the leaders and will be obeyed better if they don't have any other officers interfering."

(b) May 79: You Are What You Read

SPM says this letter is of continuing relevance.

Timothy, a member of Berg's household, is being told not to read "those ridiculous text books in college full of lies and distortions of man". Even if they were not lies, "it was just a waste of time on foolishness." He says:-

"I don't see what business you've got being in our Family if you are not interested enough to read the Mo letters, including the old ones to see where we came from and how we got this way."

"I am God's man for this hour and I am the prophet of God for you, and you had better believe it or you are in serious spiritual trouble."

"This is the time when you ought to be studying your bible and Moletters, the word of God, and not wasting your time on ridiculous words, lies, deceits and distortions of man and the devil."

(c) Also May 79; "Book Burning - You are What you Read: Part 2.

This continues his talk to Tim and the theme is the same. He says:-

"Why don't you read the old letters that you have never read? You will find there is a lot of truth in every one of them. If you find anything wrong with them, please let me know. If you are right, I'll be glad to correct it. You either believe the letters or don't. Don't tell me, "I believe parts of it, I believe some of it" You can take it or leave it. But if you want to survive in this Family you better take it! Or leave!"

(d) August 1989 "D.O. is for DOers."

I have already quoted from this letter which lists the excommunicable offences.

(e) September 1989 Heavenly Security - Part 3

This lists "personal problems" which include worldliness (which means hankering for the world outside), murmuring (voicing doubts or criticism) and backsliding. A

backslider is "anyone who says that they don't accept the letters." They are scorned as "God's vomit".

(f) February 1992 (which is when the Ward was born) Summit 92 - "Our Problems and the Lord's Solutions"

Whereas the letters "You are what you read" are clear expressions of opinion and, according to the passage I have already cited, could be wrong, what is reported in this Good News 495 is the word of God speaking through prophecy. This letter should therefore command obedience from the faithful. It contains these passages:-

"Over and over again the Lord emphasised the point that he had already given us the direction we need through the words of David. The main message ... was that we should go back to the basics, back to the plan he has so clearly revealed to Dad, and obey and do what is already written. During the last meeting the Lord said: "... Doth thou not see that obedience unto the words of David is the key?..." He seemed to want to re-emphasise to us all, through these prophecies, the importance of reading obeying and living the Letters."

The words are capable of wide application, as I am sure they were intended to be, but the narrower issues which confronted that summit meeting related to the progress of the DTR, the Discipleship Training Revolution, to deal with the difficulties being experienced with the young at that time, 1991. The message to the Teens is to obey.

It is difficult to come to an easy or confident conclusion about how influential the letters were. SPM, on behalf of The Family, conceded that they were influential but asserted that the members were at liberty to disagree. The expert Doctor Millikan was is convinced that members believe they have freedom to make their own assessments, which must be right, but the heavy emphasis on obedience leads me to conclude that the choice will be exercised in favour of submitting to rather than rejecting Berg's writing. I agree with Doctor Millikan when he writes:

"but they also live with a belief that gives them no expectation that David Berg could ever lead them astray." I bear that conclusion in mind when I assess the influence the writings have had on the sexual mores and practices of The Family.

THE FAMILY'S VIEW OF THE OUTSIDE WORLD

I read in their "Statement of Faith" that through Adam and Eve's fall from grace through sin, all mankind are now sinners absolutely unable to attain to righteousness without the saving power of Jesus Christ. They see Satan as the usurper who now rules as an unholy God of this world. He is an active force for evil in the world. They follow Biblical teaching literally on this matter. They believe that Satan actively subverts the lives of those who do not know Christ as Saviour, that he continues to harass the lives of those who are saved and to undermine their faith and obedience to God. So, writes Dr Millikan, "there is great emphasis within the literature of The Family on trust, obedience, "resting in the Lord" and "yieldedness." Since the world is essentially hostile to the Gospel and to all who are its representatives, they reject "the unchristian pursuits and practices of the world" and believe they should "avoid conformity with worldly attitudes." In their earlier literature they painted horrific pictures of the system and the systemites and the literature abounds with the "traumatic testimonies" of those who leave the group and come to unspeakable harm when in the world.

THE FAMILY'S PERCEPTION OF PERSECUTION

They believe that Christians who actively witness and live for Jesus Christ will receive persecution. Quite the most

frightening persecution has been the action taken by the authorities in Argentina, Australia, Spain, France, and by me. Persecution was the main matter of discussion at their summit '93 and GN 539 of February 1993 acknowledges that benefits have flown from the Court actions taken across the world because "all things work together for good to them that love God" and that "includes persecution."

THE FAMILY'S ATTITUDE TO LIES AND DECEPTION.

One cannot have listened, as I have listened to over 30 members of The Family without being impressed by and in many ways filled with admiration for their total dedication to their discipleship, to their belief in the teachings of their master, Jesus Christ, and to their spreading of His Gospel. Believing, as they do, in an active Satan, their inclination is, as Berg expresses it: "for God's sake, speak the truth". They are, however, a beleaguered group facing what they consider to be persecution by this litigation. Consequently, they permit an exception to telling the truth when doing so will result in tragic consequences to The Family. In his letter to me, Peter Amsterdam defines that as "being injury, loss of life, severe loss of freedom, or permanent cessation of one's ability to preach the Gospel." that is not necessarily a complete list of occasions when deception is permitted. In "Deceivers yet True", June 1979, Berg seemed to countenance deceit and sometimes outright lies to accomplish God's purpose. In an undated "Deceivers yet True" comic for children, the stories depicted:

"show that the Lord allowed His people to deceive their enemies - and even tell them outright lies - when it was necessary to save His work or the lives of His people." Caution is urged before doing so. In "More Examples of Deceivers Who were True" The Family were told:-

"We're in a dangerous war and when it is necessary to protect the security of the Lord's work and his children, you may have to lead people to believe that something is a certain way when it's really not that way."

There are, therefore, words of much wider application than Peter Amsterdam suggested and they are certainly wide enough to cover The Family's approach to this litigation.

That is made clear from a letter from Creations to those then involved in the Australian litigation. The Creation team were then in April 1992 creating valuable guide lines on how to tackle tricky questions and answer the accusations that were being made against The Family. In separate publications, one for adults and early adults only and the other as required reading for teens aged 14 and up, "False Accusers in the Last Days" The Family were prepared for having to make the choice between believing God's word or man's word. They were warned of the enemy's dirty tactics and his goal of trying to discredit Dad, the Word and The Family. Advice on how to handle accusations, controversies and concerns was set out in a 48 page document for the adults, "Contending for the Faith" and in 56 pages of "Wise Witnessing Replies", required reading for all over 11 years of age. I find that a huge effort has been made to prepare The Family generally and to prepare the witnesses specifically in how to deal with the challenges to their way of life. The fact that they have been prepared does not, of course, mean that they have been prepared to lie and Peter Amsterdam wrote that as yet unpublished remarks from Maria were passed on to those involved in this litigation to this effect:-

"The Court is a place where they must be honest no matter how embarrassing or threatening to The Family they feel their answers are going to be I would rather have then saying something that would supposedly "hurt" The Family than to ever

perjure themselves and destroy their credibility."

Nonetheless, I regret to find that in many instances there has been a lack of frankness and a failure to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. By way of example:-

1. Answers to the Official Solicitor's interrogatories were less than full and frank in material respects which I will deal with later.

2. EM who has important child care responsibilities, was frank enough to admit that she would lie to protect the children and I regret to find that is at times exactly what she did.

3. The Family's Australian lawyer considered it appropriate to make a video recording of conditions in various homes in various countries to place before the Australian Court as evidence of what life was like in a typical home. MA was recorded saying that "The barrister has asked me to describe the surroundings of the 271/2 acre plot that we live on." He continued, "We live in a very productive part of England ... When we first moved in, this place was completely overgrown and unusable ... We have managed to clear it and make it a place for the children In the back garden over here we have our fourth daughter KAS playing with the ferrets." No one listening to that recording could think otherwise than that that was MA's home. It was not. His wife LA told the listener that "in all my experience all these years in The Family, I have found the children to be happy well adjusted children." She said the same to me in her affidavit sworn in these proceedings and repeated that all children she has met were happy and well adjusted. There was no mention of the Victor programmes to deal with difficult children that had been running in her homes as well she knew.

4. In another video prepared for the Australian Court, film was made of a home in Denmark and the children were asked, more than once, whether they had heard of silence restrictions. No one raised a hand. SC remained mute. He knew about silence restriction. He had been on silence restriction himself. I had been impressed by his evidence until that point and there was much about him which was likeable. When pressed about this discrepancy, he tried at first to shrug it off as not being a "life or death situation." When pressed he explained that he had not told the truth because of his embarrassment for he had no wish to explain why he had been placed on silence restriction and that he was "a rotten apple." What is disturbing, therefore, about this evidence is not only the lack of frankness in presenting material to another Court but also the psychological pressure that had been put upon the boy by the experience of being put on silence.

5. Another transcript prepared for Australia included an apparently enthusiastic JG telling the Australian Court how happy he was. He was not happy. He lied because he could not stand up to the shepherd and tell them that in fact he wished to leave The Family. It is again an example of a lack of candour together with emotional pressure being put upon the young members of the group.

6. In September 1990 a boy SM ran away from a Family home, Burnt Farm in Hertfordshire. He was apprehended at Ramsgate trying to cross the Channel. When the Social Services Department investigated the matter, and called Burnt Farm, a shepherd, RM, denied that he had anything to do with the Children of God, It was a blatant lie. Significantly, also, the home was closed in a hurry and the members dispersed. Could there be a clearer example of Deceivers yet True? From the children comic I quote:-

"If you knew that enemies would persecute you and your Family and all your brothers and sisters and chase you out

of their city, if you didn't HAVE to, would you tell them who you are?" (Their emphasis.)

It is an example of a practice I find to have been widespread. "Selah" is a word known to all members of The Family. It means secret. The system must not know it. It is an attitude of mind which prepares them to hide, run away, remove the trunk with The Family literature, take their packed "flee-bag" containing a minimum of essential personal possessions and escape.

Things have probably changed over the past 4 years. The Family are more open. The best evidence of that is their willingness to contest this litigation. It was a matter which was the subject of the Summit 93. But even now, The Family still cannot be fully frank, even with their own lawyers. They write:

"We have given some of our legal counsellors nearly full sets of Mo letters so they can properly prepare our defence." (The added emphasis is mine.)

They do not trust even their own lawyers. They do not fully trust their own experts and I gained the impression that Doctor Millikan was less than pleased and Doctor Heller was certainly deeply dismayed because he felt he had been misled by The Family.

These are worrying examples and they are not the only ones of the ingrained habit of lying if they have to and of telling half the truth if they can get away with it. I shall in due time have to give careful consideration to the extent of change within The Family and to the crucial question of whether I am able to trust them.

As I begin the process of evaluating the evidence and arriving at decisions on the disputed matters of fact, I remind myself again not only to be on guard that pressures from the anti-cult movements may have caused distortion of the Plaintiff's evidence but also that the examples I have set out above demonstrate to me quite clearly a pervasive tendency on the part of The Family to be economical with the truth. I turn, at last, to deal with the disputed matters of fact.

SEXUALLY INAPPROPRIATE BEHAVIOUR

I shall judge the oral evidence I have received against the background of Family literature.

GENERAL ATTITUDES TO SEXUAL MATTERS:

Berg was born in 1919. He married mother Eve in 1943 when he was about 24 years old. He met Maria in January 1969 shortly before his 50th birthday. He has written that he had been faithful to his wife for 25 years "until that faithfulness began to stand in God's way and hinder the work. So then God had to raise up someone who could fit the bill in this great new ministry in our lives ... The answer was Maria." So began their menage a trois. This ran counter to the prevailing sexual mores of the group. It was primarily a group of hippies who by all accounts had had their fill of the promiscuous life which the permissive sexual age had opened up to them. The "Revolutionary Rules", which I have not seen, had been written in 1968 and outlined the basic requirements for membership. Those rules clearly stated, apparently, that no dating, kissing or sexual involvement whatever was allowed outside monogamous marriage. I am not sure how Berg managed to make himself the exception to the rule but he found some scriptural justification for it. The "All Things Revelation" that "All things are lawful unto me and that to the pure all things are pure", was set out in a letter "The All Things Tree" which has not been disclosed to me. Those texts were constructed literally in order to confer freedom to engage in sexual relationships outside marriage - even if at that time only

the leadership enjoyed the privilege. By 1973 The Family was being exposed to more revolutionary sex teaching that

"the normal, healthful, natural God-created, God-given and God-permitted attitude to sex should be absolutely no different from our attitude toward any other normal physical activity such as eating, exercising or even sleeping. ... If it is in love it is lawful as far as God is concerned."

Berg informed his followers that he found little girls just as fascinated with his erections and quite as willing to feel them as he was to attempt to explore their bodies. He had his first intercourse at the early age of 7. An older boy taught him to masturbate at the age of 8. He wrote:-

"Children should be taught the same: that there is nothing wrong with their bodies, and nothing evil about sex and nothing catastrophic about masturbation, but that all are perfectly normal necessary natural and God given natural physical functions, but that Our bodies in no respect must ever be abused or misused or overused or used in such a way as to offend or hurt others or the uninitiated unenlightened unliberated or sexually uneducated or inexperienced. They should be encouraged in nude mix bathing and nude mix play where socially, legally and climatically permissible and acceptable and advisable. They should also not be prohibited from mutual sexual examination, experimentation or interplay when playing or sleeping together where legally possible and social and housing conditions permit. ... But it must be made very clear to your children that such sexual freedom must never be indulged in or practised openly in the presence of visitors, strangers or uninitiated relatives and friends who have not been properly re-educated in the revolutionary sexual freedoms of natural living. From personal experience I can tell you that I have accomplished much more and done greater things and achieved greater success in God's work since I have become more sexually liberated and enjoyed greater sexual activity than ever before."

The message of this letter is in its conclusion:-

"Hallelujah, I am free - Jesus gives us liberty - Amen? - Now try! - You'll like it! - and thank God for it! Amen? Its a revolution! - For Jesus! Power to the people! - Sex power! - God power! - Can be your power! Amen? - Be a sexual revolutionist for Jesus! Wow! There we go again! Hallelujah! Are you comin'?"

Later he wrote "Come on Ma Burn your Bra" in which he told the young:

"We have a sexy God and a sexy religion with a very sexy leader with an extremely sexy young following! So if you don't like sex, you better get out while you can."

He was paving the way for sharing and Flirty Fishing.

THE LAW OF LOVE

His philosophy was encapsulated in "The Law of Love" written in March 1974. The copy exhibited to the Plaintiff's affidavit contains a singularly disgusting picture. I find it blasphemous. In the background was Christ crucified, "God's lamb." Lying in similar cruciform position on her back was a naked lady with a large nail driven into her vagina ("Your lamb?"). The captions were, "Can a couch be your cross? Are you willing to be nailed? The law of love!" A similar picture appeared some 4 years later in the letter "You are the Love of God", written to encourage Flirty Fishing, with this passage:-

"Every one of you girls who spreads out your arms and your legs on the bed for those men are just like Jesus, exactly like Jesus."

"The Law of Love" is another letter on "All things" He wrote in March 1974:-

"We are the last church! We are God's last church, the last step in God's progress towards total freedom for his church and the last chance to prove that the ultimate church can be trusted with total freedom in this last generation". To understand that one has to remember that Berg is the End Time prophet who will lead his people into the millennium where they will enjoy a thousand years of sexual freedom. Then followed an important passage:-

"This last generation of the church will probably have as much trouble in handling such freedom as did its first generation. It's like giving a growing child a little more liberty at each new stage of development, a little more complicated and possibly even more DANGEROUS TOY" (his emphasis but also mine!) "ushering in a new stage of growth and responsibility to see if he can be trusted with it. If he uses it wisely, he will be given more. If he plays with it foolishly and dangerously it may be taken away from him.... Can you handle this new toy safely so as to bring joy and pleasure to yourself and others around you without endangering anyone or harming anyone or infringing on anyone else's freedoms and others rights? Can you be trusted with it, or will you abuse it and use your liberty as licence to do wrongfully and lustfully instead of rightfully and lovingly? Will you use it to heal and help or harm and hinder? The answer is up to you. Are you so ruled by His love that he can liberate you from the rules or do you have to be kept under the law of works because you cannot be trusted with the liberty of his grace? The answer is up to you."

He went on to draw a crucial distinction between lust and love:-

"Lust is merely to gratify your own selfish appetite, like eating a meal. You may need it, but if you are stealing it from someone else and taking the food out of their mouth to stuff your own, this is selfish lust, not love! But if you are taking the food out of your own mouth and giving your own meal to satisfy and feed another who is hungry and starving for love and needs it desperately and might not survive without it, then this is real love.... Can you handle it? Are you revolutionary enough? We shall see!"

We shall indeed!

On July 29th 1977 The Children of God published the letter "God's Only Law is Love! - What the Bible says about true free love!" (his double emphasis.)

"All things are lawful for me including our sexual freedom, as long as it is done in the unselfish, sacrificial love of God. No, we do not have to keep the Ten Commandments! For us they are no more! for us they are gone forever! Thank God! We now only live to keep God's law of love, his only law - love! For the laws of Moses are no more to the believer in Jesus! We now only have the law of Jesus, God's only law, his love! - a stronger law than Moses' is! Therefore whatsoever you do in the unselfish sacrificial love of Jesus is right and lawful! Whatever you do in love is the law - and that's all, that's it! God's only law is love! We are totally utterly free of the old mosaic law, thank God! we are delivered from the old mosaic law and are no longer bound by it - we are free! Now all things are lawful to us in love, praise God! As long as it's done in love it keeps God's only law of love!"

It is difficult to reconcile this freedom with The Family's attempt to answer "Interview's 202 Lies about the Children of God" written on 12th June 1977, i.e. six weeks before this letter explained to his disciples what the bible said about true free love. There the answer was given:-

"Lie number 19, they say "we enjoy free love": we have condemned "free love" in any of our homes or colonies and have forbidden any kind of what is normally known as free love

among certain communities, meaning total promiscuity, in which we do not believe."

No doubt the pedant within World Services would contend that The Family do not believe in "total promiscuity" because it would no doubt be defined by The Family as sexual activity born of lust. But The Family do believe in sexual activity freely enjoyed by consenting parties who can convince themselves that they are each sacrificing the sanctity of their body in order "lovingly" to satisfy a need of the other. In its way this is an example of dissembling the truth - deceiving yet true.

On 20th May 1980 Father David wrote "The Devil Hates Sex! - but God Loves It!" The Family were coy about producing this letter. It came very late in the day and was produced from the archive of Dr Melton. One can understand the reticence. There are passages on incest and "child sex". Mo's theology is that God made Adam and Eve male and female, not the devil.

"God blessed them and said, be fruitful and multiply!" - in other words, "go to it, start fucking! right out here in the open, in public, in the garden, on the grass!" I suppose some narrow-minded blue-nosed church people would say, "Oh yes, but that's before sin entered in. That's before they discovered sex and how wicked it was! - and after all, that was also really in private because there wasn't anyone else around yet!" Boy oh boy oh boy! that makes me so mad. The thing that makes me mad is that man has allowed the devil to deceive him like that and has been such a stupid idiot as to believe the devil's lies that sex is evil and sex is the worst sin of all and must be the most prohibited. The devil would certainly like to prohibit it completely if he could, and he has restricted it so that things have not moved as fast as they should have..... The only way to get free of (the devil) and his lies and his prohibitions and guilt complexes about sex is to get rid of his lies and his lying propaganda, his anti-sex propaganda, and believe the Lord and his word and his creation and God's love and his freedom! - that there is nothing in the world at all wrong with sex as long as it's practiced in love, WHATEVER IT IS OR WHOEVER IT'S WITH, NO MATTER WHO OR WHAT AGE OR WHAT RELATIVE OR WHAT MANNER (my emphasis) - and you don't hardly dare even say these words in private. If the law ever got a hold of this, they would try to string me up! They would probably lynch me before I got to the jail! When Paul said "All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient" (1 COR 6: 12), he was as good as saying, "I can indulge in any kind of sex I want to, but I've got to watch out for the system because it's against the law!" (Maria: AT LEAST NOT LET'M FIND OUT IF YOU DO IT!)... We are free in privacy, and that's about all, and we mightn't be free if they discovered what we do in private!... There are NO RELATIONSHIP RESTRICTIONS OR AGE LIMITATIONS in his law of love.... If you hate sex you are one of the devil's crowd! If you think it's evil, then God and love are evil, for he created it! Come on, let's love and enjoy it like God does! he loves it!"

I have added that the emphasis in these passages. They need to be emphasised. The meaning is perfectly plain. Berg advocates the enjoyment of this new freedom to engage in sexual activity with whomsoever one desires regardless of the age of that person or the closeness of the relationship to that person subject only to such restraint as is encapsulated in the admonition that the activity must be engaged in love and that is to say "without endangering anyone, or harming anyone, or infringing on anyone else's freedoms and other's rights", quoting from the original Law of Love.

THE EVIDENCE ON SEXUAL ATTITUDES GENERALLY

No witness called on behalf of the Defendant has repudiated the Law of Love. It is the cornerstone of The Family's creed. NT's closing words to me were to plead with me not to denigrate the Law of Love. It was an extraordinary observation from her. I would have expected her to plead with me not to remove her son. Many mothers, often totally hopeless mothers, have begged for that mercy. But NT did not. It was as if the integrity of the Law of Love was more important to her than S. Where is her sense of priorities?

The oral evidence was overwhelming that the members of The Family generally adopted a freer lifestyle than was the norm in any of the countries in which they live. I am satisfied and I find that the attitude of the members of The Family towards all forms of a sexual conduct was that it was a God-given gift to be engaged in without embarrassment. Nudity was not uncommon and sexual activity was not discreet. I find the Law of Love to be a pernicious doctrine because in liberating the ordinary sexual inhibitions, the Law of Love empowers those with strong sexual urges but poor judgment to act indiscriminately and it put pressure upon the weak to succumb to that which does in fact harm them and infringe their freedom. In short the Law of Love was liable to be abused and was calculated to be abusive.

FLIRTY FISHING (FFING)

Whilst living in London late in 1973, David and Maria went ballroom dancing. Many at their dancing club were lost and lonely. It was an opportunity to witness to them. Recollecting how in the Gospel of St. Matthew 4:19, Jesus said to his disciples, "Follow me and I will make you fishers of men", Berg cast his bait, the lure of Maria's sexual appeal, to hook a fish on God's word. As the family literature explained,

"Sex and actual love making (became) a means of witnessing to and showing them (those with whom they wanted to share their faith) a tangible sample and proof of the sacrificial love of God."

Not surprisingly when the practice became widespread, the media coined the phrase "Hookers for Jesus". The Family seemed offended by the description. They should not have been. Berg himself in the letter "God's whores" disclosed that:-

"I threatened to call one of those first chapters we wrote 'God's whore'. I was going to really shock people! I love shocking titles that provoke people and wake them up".

One of the earliest letters was "Flirty Little Fish" in January 1974. It is important to note that the letter is an account of a prophecy Berg received from God, which gives the letter special authority. Not surprisingly, not many who read it and then understood its implications and how allegory was soon to be translated into action. The letter contained these passages recording his prayer:

"Help Maria to catch this fish. Give her, Lord, thy web. In Jesus' name! Make the lure so attractive he cannot resist it! He's hypnotised! He's fascinated in that which he dreams of, the materialisation of a dream of love, the spirit embodied in her flesh for which he hungers! He hungers for the flesh, Oh God, but he hungers more for the spirit. Help her to catch him with her fingers of flesh that she might impart unto him thy spirit, Oh Lord, for which he hungers. Oh God, in Jesus' name! Each one of them seek after her, suck of her, dream of her, drink of her! Help her, Oh God, to catch the fish faithful to be a fisherman of men. Help her Oh God to catch men! Help her to catch men, be bold unashamed and brazen, to use anything she has, Oh God to

catch men for thee! Even if it be through the flesh, the attractive lure, the delicious flesh on a steel hook of thy reality, the steel of thy spirit! Hook them through her flesh! Crucify her flesh, Lord, on the barb of thy spirit! Oh God, even if it penetrate and crucify her flesh, impale her on the point of thy spirit that she may die, that those who feed on her flesh may be caught to live! Oh God, help her, Oh Jesus to be willing to be the bait!"

In this way Maria and Becky and others close to the leaders began their seduction of the men in the clubs in London. In a series of letters called "King Arthur's Knights" the disciples and friends were given some explicit instruction. I say explicit for chapter 7 could not be more plain. In it Maria asked Berg how she should proceed and she got the answer: "Fuck the daylights out of him!" and the drawings which accompany that message demonstrate, as if graphic demonstration was needed, how she should "grab his dick out of his pants." In January 1977 they published the "FFer's Handbook" which is 31 closely typed pages of the "complete instruction manual on FFing." I condescend to this nasty detail only for the purpose of making the point that literature of this kind, and it is one of an infinite number of filthy examples, lay about on the bookshelves of The Family for years and years until the literature purge began in April 1990 and so was freely available to the children in the homes. The children were well aware of this ministry and knew full well what their mothers and sometimes their fathers were up to. They knew all about "Jesus babies", the children born to the FFers who, as a group, did not believe in contraception. One sees this in the "Life with Grandpa" and "Beauty and the Beast" comic series written for children. In the comic "Real Fathers", the children are introduced to Davidito and Tech, Jesus babies born to Maria. Grandpa i.e. Berg, is seen explaining to Davidito and Tech sitting on his lap, that:

"God just used Timothy and Carlos only to fuck Mama so that I could have you both! They were just like an instrument or tool that Jesus used to help create you wonderful little children for his kingdom! Praise the Lord!"

He went on to explain how the farmer used a big plough to open a furrow for the seed to be planted and how the farmer thereafter tended the crop. He asked who was the real father of the crop? The farmer who loved it and took care of the crop until it was fully grown or the plough that just opened the furrow for the seed to be planted? The children answered the farmer, of course! Berg then explained that a penis was like a plough and a woman's womb was like a furrow in which the man planted his seed and the comic then had drawings of the plough in the soil and the penis in the vagina. I have had to look at text like that and pictures like that over these many months but still I recoil from them. I find that children exposed as they have been to widespread activity of this kind and to literature as crude as that are children who have been abused for they have been robbed of their childhood sensibilities and have been exposed to that from which they should be protected.

FFing was undoubtedly a widespread activity. I accept that it was voluntary and that Berg had "said time and time again, F Fing is not for everybody. It's only for special people who really have the guts and the time and the talent and so on. It's not for everybody!" There was, however, very great pressure on the disciples to take part in this "ministry." The very failure of the "chain" leaders fully to implement it, led to the RNR. Berg wrote that it was not for "old bottles" and so, as Prof Richardson wrote "The FFing involvement is thought of as a test of commitment for the members. Only the 'absolutely 100%'ers" would be involved, Berg said, and he did not seem to mind if some left over FFing." The women involved had to be willing to

to the length of having sexual intercourse in order to show the love of God to the men they witnessed to. That was their sacrifice. So in the letter "You are the Love of God" published in 1978 the sacrifice was described. This letter was another with the drawing of the the naked woman spread-eagled on the bed which I find so utterly repugnant to decency.

I am quite satisfied that most of the women who engaged in this activity and the subsequent refinement of ESing, (which was finding men through escort agencies), did so in the belief that they were spreading God's word. But I am also totally satisfied that that was not Berg's only purpose. He and his organisation had another and more sordid reason. They were procuring women to become common prostitutes. They were knowingly living in part on the earnings of prostitution. That was criminal activity. Their attempts to deny this must be dismissed as cant and hypocrisy.

To deny that the girls were acting as prostitutes because "we are not charging but we expect people to show their thanks and their appreciation and they ought to give more for love than if we charged them" is an unacceptable form of special pleading. The "FFers handbook" told the girls that fishing could be fun but fun did not pay the bills. "You've got to catch a few to make the fun pay for itself. So don't do it for nothing." To add that, "We're not in it for the money, but we are in it for the men" was an addition to deceive the gullible girls. In volume 4 of "Heavenly Helpers", "Bought with a Price", Berg wrote that:

"Many homes need more financial support at this time to prepare for their survival as well as their day to day needs and this kind of ministry has really given the homes the boost they needed to tide us through some very tight financial spot." That is more like the truth. But once again truth had to be dressed up in half truth. In asking "Does FFing Pay", in January 1978 Berg wrote:-

"Now we have claimed and we have said with conviction and it's the truth, that our girls never accept money. We have told the kids and we have told the magazines and we told the authorities, "Our girls are forbidden to accept a penny. They have never received anything for their sexual services". And that's the truth as far as I am concerned. Whatever the man donated was for the work. ... It's a nice way of doing it really. "Well, here's a donation for the work. Here's for the piece of furniture. Here's to help on the meal you gave me last night, your food," or whatever. Not a direct payment to the woman just for a fuck, which causes and makes it crude and about as low as you can get, just like the rest of the world, but if they can feel like they are not just paying a prostitute but that they are actually giving it to the Lord and the work, this I think we would all feel very acceptable, including the fish themselves, right? It has got to come to this sooner or later. ... We can't afford just continuing supporting some kind of religious brothel, ministering to men who don't pay their way."

Eventually in 1986, it was realised that:

"Sex only has to be a last resort, and if you can (witness to them) any other way, you should. Usually all the other ways are a lot easier and a lot less time consuming so why deliberately try to get involved in a sexual relationship with them?"

Although it is claimed that between 1977 and 1987 over a hundred thousand people, fifty per cent of all those who were F Fed, had been personally led to Jesus Christ as a direct result of the F Fing ministry, that represented only one per cent of the recorded total of over ten million souls won world wide over that ten year span.

In 1986 a new "Daily Food" ministry was developed through the publication and distribution of a series of booklets

entitled "Daily Food" and "DFing" replaced FFing. As the spectre of Aids loomed over the world, Berg officially put an end to FFing in September 1987, by declaring:-

"All sex with outsiders is banned! - unless they are already close and well known friends! - we are now D -Fing instead!"

I am satisfied that the practice has indeed ceased.

THE EVIDENCE ON FFING

The evidence called revealed these facts:-

1. Almost without exception (SF being the only exception I now recollect) the adult women who gave evidence practised FFing.

2. Those who remain within The Family would do so again. Those within The Family, men and women, and this includes NT and CT, see nothing wrong with it. They do not see it to be immoral; they do not see it as destructive of personal relationships; they are offended when it is described as prostitution. For them it is a sacred, sacrificial ministry. They believe that no greater love hath anyone than this. And for the men that included "laying down their wives" for another. No challenge to their common sense shifts any one of them from those fiercely proclaimed convictions.

3. I find that fervour disturbing. It demonstrates the power which Berg wields through his letters to suborn the will of his disciples so that they do not know right from wrong. The error of her chosen way hit MCH when it suddenly dawned on her how "atrocious" it would be if her father were to be the next fish. Then she felt ashamed not privileged that her prophet had chosen her to break up families. VJ now looks back with equal horror to her activities. I have no doubt that the ambience of the hotels and restaurants where she hooked her fish was a good deal better than the cramped quarters of the communes where she lived and that it was a respite from oppressive surroundings but I find that it was an unworthy attack on this lady by The Family to suggest that she engaged in Flirty Fishing because she enjoyed it. I accept that at the time she assumed Berg to be a man of God, as the current members still assume him to be a man of God, and so it seemed to her to be "incomprehensible he could be evil or the Bible used for evil." She spoke convincingly of her deep horror and regret at having taken part and it has made her very angry.

4. I also find it disturbing that The Family cannot see that the practice of FFing was harmful to the children in The Family. Such harm arose from from these matters:-

(a) The children were exposed to the explicit literature as I have set out above.

(b) I am perfectly satisfied that many, many children were full aware that their mothers were away FFing and were aware, therefore, that their mothers were engaged in sexual activity with strangers.

(c) I am satisfied that the "Jesus babies" suffer from the knowledge that their father is unknown to them and that they have had no contact with their father.

(d) I am satisfied that some Jesus babies will suffer future harm for some have not been told the truth about their paternity yet, and when the truth is revealed to them, they will suffer deep distress.

(e) I am satisfied, therefore, that this practice was inimical to the welfare of the children. In my judgment the end never could justify the means.

I am satisfied, however, that it has ceased and I judge there to be no substantial risk that it will be resumed. This finding must be given its proper weight. It is a sensational part of The Family's history which has helped to give them such

notoriety. But it is now a matter of history and however reprehensible and misguided it was, it is not a matter which impinges directly on the well-being of my ward.

SHARING

The "Revolutionary Rules" written in 1968 laid down a strict code of no sexual activity outside of a monogamous marriage. That was relaxed by the "All Things" revelation in 1970 but the liberty to engage in sexual relationships outside marriage was one taken only by the leaders. Within a year Berg realised that some of his leaders were misusing those freedoms and he had to rebuke some who had been "more interested in pleasing the flesh and even causing some of the weaker brethren to stumble." "Sin in the Camp" MO143 dated 1971. I note this as an early lesson from which Berg ought to have learned that his flock would abuse the freedoms which his teachings offered them. There is no evidence that he did learn from it. The "One Wife" letter published in 1973 alluded to the possibility that sexual relations outside of monogamous marriage could be permissible. He planted the idea that the marriage of the individual to the group was the only true marriage. The message was not widely received. In 1974 the FFing experiment began. The result of freeing the women to go outside to have sexual relations imposed a strain on the men within and it became anomalous to expect the married men to remain faithful to their wives or the single men to remain celibate. The RNR threw off the shackles of past inhibitions. The leadership were no longer in control of the sexual activity of the members. The members were free. So Berg wrote in February 1978, the "Happy Re-birthday" letter in which he declared:-

"Family sex: no permission needed for sex! - if legal and with mutual consent. No servants (leaders) need to be consulted. Fire away! Praise God!"
In a document compiled by World Services on behalf of The Family being SPM's 56th exhibit, The Family acknowledged that:

"a period of great sexual liberation ensued. Single adults who had not had their sexual needs met for years had the opportunity to have sexual fellowship with consenting partners, who cheerfully and sometimes sacrificially chose to give of themselves to help these brethren. The ability to sexually share with other members within the community brought a degree of unity that was hitherto unknown. Family members discovered that having sexual fellowship with others of the opposite sex, regardless of whether they were single or someone else's mate led to much deeper emotional relationships and a greater understanding and love for one another. Singles were extremely grateful when married family members would allow their wife's husbands to share with them so that they could have their sexual needs met. Married couples who ventured to occasionally swap partners with other married couples broke out of their own private personal marriage relationships and suddenly found themselves much more in tune to an understanding of others' needs and relationship. All of this fostered a more caring understanding and loving atmosphere in our communities which is what Father David had envisioned all along. ... In the euphoria of long awaited change, everyone was eager to exercise their new freedoms. Revelry and renunciation of the former repressive system and its restrictions were the order of the day. In many cases, caution was thrown to the wind."

In 1981 the Fellowship Revolution called for Family homes to meet together regularly for spiritual fellowship. It was becoming clear to Berg by 1973 that in some areas The Family

had apparently lost sight of the original purpose of those meetings and that "many adults had become preoccupied with personal intimate relationships." Sexually transmitted diseases were being passed between the homes at such meetings and Berg responded by placing a ban upon inter-home sex at any area fellowship. Within the home sharing continued. The scriptural exhortation to "Love one another without partiality" (1 Timothy 5:21) was taken literally in the belief that the sexual needs of all members should be met as equitably as possible. Implementing that was complex. If anyone was unable to manage to arrange a satisfactory sharing relationship with another, he or she was able to seek the help of the overseer of the home's sharing schedule. These sharing schedules were not universally found in every home and they were never part of Family policy. As the scheme reported in the "Jumbo Story" in 1988, it enabled members of the home to "get to spend love-up time with specific partners at least a couple of times a week". Sharing arrangements are said to be strictly voluntary and I do not doubt that, but I am equally satisfied that once again great pressure was put upon members to submit to requests because not to do so was selfish and selfishness was not to be tolerated. Sharing, like FFing, is another example of sacrificial love. Indeed The Family use the sacrificial nature of sexual sharing to defend themselves against the charge of promiscuity. World Services in their history of the sexual policies of The Family say this:-

"Learning that The Family engaged in FFing and continues to share sexually among members of the group, can cause a non-member to draw the conclusion that we inspire indiscriminate promiscuity or "Free Love". Such a conclusion indicates a lack of understanding of the true dynamics of sexual sharing within The Family. Sharing a mate or loved one with another requires a great deal of sacrificial love for the third party. ... A large degree of sacrificial love is also necessary when mates share with others within The Family today."

Sexual intercourse between adults whether a sacrificial or a promiscuous activity is not a matter of major concern to the court if it takes place in private but where the welfare of children is paramount, then any sexual activity in the presence of children must be a matter which arouses the Court's anxiety. I have already referred to the basic philosophy of The Family that when God commanded Adam and Eve to go forth and multiply, he meant that quite literally and that it was therefore wholly right that they might do it in public without embarrassment and without pretence. From the writings of The Family it does, however, seem that children were to be included among the members of the public in whose presence sexual intercourse might blatantly take place. I must refer later and in detail to "The Story of Davidito", a detailed account of the early life of Davidito, Maria's Jesus baby, written by Sara, his nanny, but here is a passage written when Davidito was aged seventeen months.

"Sex!: Little David stood watching through the pool fence as a couple made love in the water. He imitated every motion by wiggling his bottom and his right hand up and down then went into the house to show mommy the story of how to goose a girl! He is still jealous when Alfred and I love up - Daddy says he has been in love with me since the beginning! When he saw he wasn't getting our full time attention because we were "busy" in bed, he left the room and hid under the dining room table to pout. He knew that if he hid, we would have to stop and find him ..."

If that picture is accurate, then it gives some idea of the sexual ethos of the place - the couple engaging in sexual activity in the pool and the nanny and her boyfriend having sexual intercourse in the bed in the boy's presence. It gets worse. When Davidito

as three years two months old this appeared to have happened:-

"One night after a real good dinner talk by Dad on the importance of sharing and how timidity is really just pride, Dad suggested we have a "come-union". (The nauseous play on words only struck me after several readings.) "He set up a place for Maria and Timothy on the floor, we had the couch, and a sister took care of sweet Alfred upstairs. Of course it was really good for everybody to just love one another, and was especially new and humbling for dear Timothy, God bless him!" (The text is then interrupted by a small photograph of a couple having sexual intercourse above the caption "A Love-demo". The text continues:) "So Davidito just wandered around from one group to another for a long while. While watching all four of us in the living room, he said aloud to try and get our attention, "Ah-hum! I would like to play with my cars now", as if someone should stop the fun and join him. Then he thought about getting my attention and said in a very self righteous, straight way, "Sarah, I want to go upstairs and read a book about Jesus!" - how "saintly" and sweet! - he figured that he'd really get me to pay attention to such a good little boy! Ha! He did a few favours for Daddy such as turn off the lights, bring us more wine, then he went upstairs to watch Alf in action. Whenever Dito had ever seen me with Daddy before he'd always act very jealous and sometimes naughty, so, hoping not to offend him, Daddy suggested a while later that I better go find Dito and pay him a little special attention now! And guess where I found him? Sitting on the stairs peeking down at us! So when I offered to read with him he told me, "I have already read this book because with this "Love-make" going on, Alf just threw me the book when I was in my bed and said here, read this! So I have already read it. It's about the first airplane that men flew." (It was about the Wright Brothers!). So next he wanted his turn, and as soon as I got into bed he jumped on me and said, "Sarah, love me!" He specifically asked for several swigs of wine, and got "happy" real quick, so we really had a good time! Alf, Tim and Mommy were outside the door listening to him. "Sarah, now kiss it!", and then he began to laugh and laugh. "Oh, it flopped in your nose! ...!

I have no doubt from the context of the book as a whole that what Sarah was required to kiss was his penis. Exposure of a young child to a sexual activity of that kind is in my judgment utterly deplorable. Those guilty of abusing Davidito by wholly inappropriate exposure to sex included the leader and his likely successor. Their attitude to these matters was fully set out in the letter "My Childhood Sex" in which it was written:-

"In nearly all families they watch couples making love and parents fucking etc - so what? it's perfectly natural! (Sara: Davidito's seen it too; he knows what it is. He knows the results too! He sees pregnant girls' big tummies. He's seen it in books, he knows all about it. He knows you get up and wash afterwards and everything, he knows all about it! So what's new, what's "wrong"? why is it bad?) I think it's so much better that they just learn that way naturally ... (Maria: But we never knew about our parents' relationships, because they did it behind closed doors!) Yes, they hide it! isn't that terrible! They leave you so ignorant of one of the most important things in life, and act just like it was something evil it's all they're teaching that it's bad, wicked, sinful, dirty, nasty!"

As if to emphasise that it is God's will for man, the comic "Heaven's Children" has a cartoon of Heaven or the Millennium with a little girl nestling against a Lion. They are watching a naked couple in intimate contact in a pool, the man saying, "Love you" and the woman saying, "That was terrific". The Lion says, "They are really having fun" and the girl replies, "Yes it's called sex"

THE ORAL EVIDENCE RELATING TO SHARING

I can make these findings:-

1. Sharing between adults over 21 does take place within the United Kingdom. It can be voluntarily arranged between the couple and the home team-work become involved in the mediation of any disputes that may arise in the arrangements for sharing. A married partner may share but that is a decision requiring more prayer and discussion. Sharing schedules are NOT the norm.
2. NT has shared. S's father is WA, a married man. An issue arose during the course of the trial when it appeared that SPM had also shared with NT at or about the time of the child's conception. Blood tests were needed to resolve the question of paternity. SPM was excluded.
3. At the end of the hearing I was disconcerted to learn that NT was again pregnant. The stress of this litigation not surprisingly took its toll upon her and she needed to get away for some rest and relaxation. I can sympathise with that need! It was arranged that she should have a weekend away with RB, another married man. He is the putative father of the child born to her on 5th January, 1995, a boy named S2.
4. I have no evidence to suggest and I do not find that sharing, as practised in this country at this time, is flagrantly conducted in public. I have no evidence and do not find instances of group sex occurring here and now in this country though I am utterly convinced it took place elsewhere, not least in Berg's own home, and frequently within sight and sound of the children.
5. More specifically, I accept that NT has been discreet in her enjoyment of sexual relations and has not exposed S to them. Although she, like all members of the movement exults in the glory of their sexual freedom so that she, like all others, proclaims that there is nothing wrong with sex, I accept her protestation that she will not knowingly permit her son to be a witness to sexual activity.
6. I also utterly and totally satisfied by the evidence called by the Plaintiff from the young teenagers who grew up in the family in the 1970's and 1980's that it was common place for children living within The Family during those times to have grown up seeing and hearing their parents engaged in sexual intercourse not only with each other but with various and numerous partners. Berg, Maria and Sara practised what they preached and what they preached was practised by their flock. Children should not have been exposed to blatant and indiscriminate sexual activity. It was an early experience for many, many children. It robbed them of them of the precious youth. It defiled them. It was abusive. It was deplorable.

INAPPROPRIATE VIDEOS AND DANCING

This topic assumed some importance in the trial insofar as (a) it throws light on the character and proclivities of Berg and (b) it assists me in making judgments as to the credibility of those who speak for The Family in this litigation. In a vain attempt to clarify the issues, I required the Plaintiff to plead her case and in paragraph 21 of the particulars of her allegations dated September 1992, she alleged:

"Some female members of the organisation are encouraged to appear in video tapes which show them naked or scantily dressed masturbating. These video tapes are alleged to be made for the consumption of David Berg."

The answer was a denial of that allegation. In his affidavit sworn in December 1992, SPM stated that the allegation that women in The Family had been forced to masturbate on video was completely untrue. He stated the dancing was by adults.

I gave leave to the Plaintiff to file further evidence and she produced a number of video tapes said to emanate from The Family. The Family were indignant at their production and that indignation arose in part from the obvious fact that the production of these tapes utterly destroyed the case that had earlier been presented by them. Their indignation arose also out of the circumstances in which these videos were obtained. Although the evidence before me is hearsay piled upon hearsay, and so too unreliable for me to come to firm conclusions about it, there is the strongest suspicion that these videos were obtained dishonestly from the Philippines by a member of the anti-cult movement and copies were eventually passed to the Plaintiff. I am not suggesting that she was involved in any way in the theft and it was right and proper in the interests of truth and justice and to enable me to decide what is best for this child that the videos were placed before me. Consequently I was not prepared to exclude their being put in evidence because they were clearly material to the issues I had to try. I am also perfectly satisfied that even if they are compilations of different tapes they originate from The Family. Oral evidence given from several sources including the Defendant's witnesses confirmed that. Those tapes exploded the Defendant's denial. The tape called "Glorify God in the Dance" has six clips of children aged between four and twelve dancing naked or semi-naked in imitation of the older women also shown on those tapes. The tape numbered 4 includes a party scene in South America. One of the Defendant's witnesses, JC, was refreshingly frank about his making it. It showed half naked couples dancing and embracing. Children who seem to be about three or four years old were shown to be present. JC explained that he made the film "for spice" because at that time (January 1983), "That is what we did." They sent the video to Berg because they thought it would please him. Video number 5 is the "Love Video." It shows young children dancing, two girls together, scenes of masturbation and sexual intercourse or simulated sexual intercourse, a testimony from a girl called Joan admitting that she masturbated. In another clip a man Appelles says they had the Love Video from World Services, that it was so inspiring that it was a chance to share his wife with another but, more disturbing, his son J1 who seems to be about ten years old had a chance to "share" with adult Sally.

Faced with that evidence The Family were more forthcoming and in SPM's affidavit sworn in January this year, he exhibited the World Services "History on Sexual Policies" to which I have already referred. In a passage "Experimenting with Dance and Love Videos in 1980", they revealed that Berg had encouraged The Family to make the love videos. The videos:

"Explored ways to inculcate a positive body image in all of our members. ... A few of the under aged girls, admittedly unwisely, performed dances bare breasted in playful imitation of their mothers or guardians".

World Services acknowledged that:

"Father David also suggested that they could possibly also film some portions of romantic and loving heterosexual interaction between adults".

By the mid 1980's, The Family instituted a number of policies to curb liberality of this nature. In "Latest Newsflash no. 47" in April 1984, The Family were asked to erase any tapes with explicit sex scenes because some such videos had fallen into the hands of the authorities. In "Latest Newsflash No. 57" of January 1985, under aged children were urged not to take their clothes off when dancing on video because:

"You could hardly touch a more sensitive nerve in most of the systemites to enrage them and have them want to lynch

you on the spot than to bring up CHILD ABUSE, and CHILD SEX, and CHILD PORNOGRAPHY, and all that kind of ROT." I highlight these words because so to dismiss sexual perversion of that kind as "rot" is, to my mind, to provide proof positive from his own words that Berg was a man without judgment or moral scruple, and a malign corrupting influence on his susceptible followers. I simply do not understand how else this choice of language can be explained."

That is how the matter stood when the hearing commenced. Well into the hearing further documents were produced including the letter "Glorify God in the Dance" dated July 1981. The letter praises those who have:

"Bared your all perhaps for the first time before others and members of The Family, in not only your own home but realising that your dance was going to be viewed by the whole Family."

This seems to me to confirm the Plaintiff's evidence which had been denied in the pleadings that these videos were regularly seen in all Family homes. He justified the dancing in these terms:-

"Yes, dancing does sometimes lead to sex, that's for sure. Why not? It's one of God's highest forms of the expression of love, and that is what it's all about, God's love, because God is love, love is God. He expects us to love and be loving and make love - both to him and to each other - and one way we can make love to the Lord is in the spirit in praising him and singing and dancing and fucking! Hallelujah! TYJ! (Thank You Jesus) ... So if a dance is sexy, it's no more evil than sex itself. Of course, you who seem to have the idea that sex is evil naturally would think that sexy dancing was evil too."

He uttered some caution on the future dance videos:-

"Lest you repeat some of the mistakes which a few have made in our first childish stumbling attempts to create beautiful sights and sounds on video. As we first encouraged you to make some of these video tapes, we told you that love can be beautiful, but perhaps we didn't put enough emphasis on the fact that sex can also be ugly if you don't approach it from the right angle and in the right way, in the right spirit and with the right know-how. ... Although some of your love scenes were very tastefully and beautifully done, such as one by some of the folks in our own home and one which was done by WWM and another done by MWM and a few others, there were one or two which frankly were just plain down right ugly. ... We have found in some of your videos that sex can not only be beautiful but it can also be ugly, just plain coarse and crude and almost sickening, especially when there's too much of it, and it's just too raw for good taste, and some of it has left a very bad taste in our mouth when it was overdone. ... So may we suggest we have just about had enough of these actual sex act videos."

He then gave encouragement to the girls in their exotic dancing. He gave detailed descriptions in this and a subsequent letter as to precisely how they were to dance and he condescended to such detail as to specify the length of their pubic hair and the manner in which they were to rub their nipples to make them erect. He concluded:-

"I know on some of these I have been making love to Maria and she to me, and the rhythm has been so slow that in our love making it was almost difficult to eventually arrive at an orgasm because the beat was too slow, and in making love to your beautiful love videos we always like to keep time to the music, believe it or not! It just is natural and automatic with me, I can hardly do anything rhythmic without keeping time to the music or rhythm to which I am listening. If you don't speed up a few of those numbers, it's going to take me forever to goose her

her forever to jack me to the point where we can reach the final glorious conclusion! So do step up the tempo a little bit as you go along, make it a little more rapid, and I think some of you in particular would find it easier to dance and more comfortable if the final tempos were a little bit more rapid as you're getting into the fiery fury of the glorious climax, both of your dance and our sexual fervour!"

These passages give some insight into Berg's personality. Crude sex found no favour with him but in every other respect he was obsessed with sex. To require the women in the group to dance for him whether the dance was erotic, or exotic, or artistic, in order to heighten his sexual pleasure, was depraved. He might have idealized sex but he also perverted it. In the chapter "Dancing before the King", from Tech's life story, we learnt that:

"When Tech was two years four months old, she started off with one of her favourites, "Sex in Heaven". Tech was dressed just with a scarf and played during her dance with a big plume feather. Dad after viewing the children's show warned us that it wasn't very wise to film Tech all naked. At that time we lived in South Africa, which has real strict laws regarding pornography!"

There was a photograph of the naked Tech and the comment, "A drape to cover her pubic area would have been much better!" Despite the "Latest Newsflash No 57," to which I have already referred, endeavouring to restrain under-aged children removing their clothes when dancing on video, "Latest Newsflash No 112" dated November 1988 said this:

"Developing nudie-cuties! As much as Dad loves to receive your nudie-cuties, girls, he wanted to mention a word of caution about getting these developed in commercial photo shops, especially if there are any shots of under age girls on the roll. ... Therefore for any developing of nudie-cuties we would definitely suggest that you go to an area of town where people would tend to be more liberal in this respect (i.e. nightclub district etc)... So keep those gorgeous nudie-cuties coming girls but please use discretion in getting them developed."

THE ORAL EVIDENCE OF THE DANCING

There is overwhelming evidence that videos were made and distributed showing couples having sexual intercourse or simulating doing so, of women masturbating or pretending to do so, of women dancing in various states of undress and, importantly, of young girls copying those dances. The evidence is so overwhelming that I need but highlight some of the pointers to that conclusion:-

1. Firstly I have seen some of the videos. They show actual or, more likely simulated sexual intercourse, masturbation or masturbatory actions and of young girls dancing. I saw Fiona Spencer dancing and I saw her 12 year old daughter H2 copy her and I saw, shamefully, her four year old daughter MS following suit.

2. MB gave evidence, which I accept of her being taken into the woods with another lady and copying her dance. She spoke of being encouraged by the adults to engage in mutual masturbation with her 9 year old friend A1, who is also shown on the video I have seen. This was filmed by Paul and he holds office as one of the European CROs (leaders) at the moment. She saw Jeremy Spencer having sexual intercourse with Rachael and being filmed doing it. The films were made for Berg.

3. MS told me and I believed it, that she was taught to strip during her time with Music with Meaning. Zack, the camera man, filmed his own four year old daughter. MS can recall the men making lewd comments which she told me, "made

me feel funny". She saw women masturbating and she saw sexual intercourse on films. These were made "as Family entertainment". When she was in India aged about 11, The Family were asked to make a video for Berg's birthday. I note that the instruction was that girls under 12 were not to be filmed and that is some evidence, one piece among many, that Family attitudes were changing over the course of time.

4. VP told me she made that film as did SF.

5. KJ spoke of having to dance at a National Area Fellowship Meeting. I believed her. She spoke of making her costume cutting out hearts to cover her nipples and a heart to cover her pubic area. She represented the elixir of love. Much later in the case, the True Komix "The Goddess of Love" was produced and that portrays, as I have already set out, the Holy Spirit as a naked lady covered where appropriate only by her three hearts.

6. SF admitted that girls were filmed and that she herself was videoed for Berg's birthday.

7. Dr Melton, the expert called by the family, spoke of the "love videos" being sent to World Services and circulated, although only for a short time. The dance videos continued until about 1987. He was satisfied that videos of this kind were regularly shown at Fellowship Meetings as some form of entertainment or uplifting of the spirit.

8. In view of the December 1988 advice about developing nude cuties, I am less sure whether the distribution of these videos did cease in about 1987. I am, however, satisfied that it is no longer a practice to make, still less to distribute, any of these kinds of videos.

Mr Barton on behalf of the mother submits that since this can be confined to the perhaps rather nasty litter bin of history, it is irrelevant for the issues I have to try. That is true insofar as there is no risk of S's exposure to this material, but there are three matters of continuing concern to me, namely:

Firstly the corrupting influence of these videos. Dr Cameron gave evidence of this. He is an eminent, highly regarded child psychiatrist. He told me, and I accept, firstly that repeatedly to require young girls to dance in a way imitative of their elders and to expose a child's body in erotic dance, an activity which is ordinarily taboo, was part of the process of grooming children for sexual exploitation by adults. The effect of the open acceptance of this kind of video was gradually to erode the sense of taboo about the sexuality of children, thereby reducing the ability to regard sexual activity with children as abhorrent. He said that it was self deceit to think that it was not made for sexual gratification. Secondly, the insistence that the dances be done in so similar a way had the tendency to make them focused fetishist films. Thirdly, it is relevant to my enquiry to see whether or not those close to S are themselves capable of self-deception. Almost universally I find that they are. Again only by way of example, the evidence which leads to that conclusion came from:-

1. NT herself: having heard Dr Cameron's evidence, she said that it was for expert opinion to know if it was damaging for children to dance like that but "I don't think a cute little dance is damaging. If the child was told that there was some dirty old man across the seas and to do a dance for him, that would be damaging and harmful but a free normal attitude to sex or sexuality or copying their mother in a cute way, I don't think is damaging". She could not have been listening to MB and MS who at their tender age were perfectly well aware of "the dirty old man across the seas" and were instinctively aware they were demeaned. To describe the dances as "cute" is utterly naive judged against the explicit letters which link the dancing with

ex.

2. EM, one of the family's experts in child care, sent to this country to carry out an investigation into teenage problems, was prepared to accept that there had been dancing but not masturbating. She said she had not seen any of the children dancing but she thought that when they had done it in the past, it was "very artistic. I don't see anything wrong with it. There is a BEAUTIFUL (my emphasis) letter about it called "Glorifying God in dance". This demonstrates a complete lack of insight in one who played an important part in forming and implementing Family child-care policy.

3. SF: in her Affidavit she said that the allegation about children taking part in pornographic stripteases was a fabrication. Giving her the benefit of the doubt that "pornographic" qualifies stripteases so that her statement might be true on such a construction, nevertheless not to admit that children were at least involved in some kind of stripteasing is another tiny example of "Deceivers Yet True". She knew that her husband filmed 12 year old VP having to do one of these striptease dances. She did one herself. In evidence in chief she described its purpose as "an artistic dance, no sex involved at all, for us nudity does not denote sex." Under cross-examination she maintained that they did not do these dances for sex but she did accept that it was done for Berg's sexual gratification and she described that as inappropriate and unnecessary. What struck me so forcibly was that her sons FC and SC were shocked by their mother's involvement in this activity. In chief FC told me, "I don't know anything about striptease dances, honestly." He was shuffling his feet and he was lying to me. He was a prissy, smugly self-righteous young man. He had known since September 1992 of the allegations made by MB that young children were having to strip. He said he had no need to ask whether it was true or not because he doubted it very much. He found it very hard then to believe that his mother would have danced topless because she was not that kind of person. When pressed to accept that his mother's obvious sensibilities had been corrupted by the Mo letters, he defiantly refused to contemplate the implications because he declared it was not relevant today because "all I know is I am serving Jesus right now and doing the best for Him.

This is typical of the evidence I heard from Family members who, schooled in the way to deal with these questions, attempted to argue that it was no different from taking a family photograph of a little girl running naked on the beach in Greece. MM, from her present more conservative perspective, acknowledged that, "we lived in a bubble in some ways looking back". There was little, if any, full acknowledgment of the corrupting effect of the dance nor of the directive force of Berg indulging his own salacious desires.

SEXUAL ACTIVITY BETWEEN CHILDREN THE ISSUE JOINED BETWEEN THE PARTIES

In answer to the allegation that The Family had encouraged sexual activities among children, The Family answered that they had never done so. When interrogated by the Official Solicitor as to whether or not there was any verbal or written suggestion, recommendation or encouragement to permit/assist minors to act in a sexual manner with other minors, SPM swore an Affidavit that "each home had to be judged according to its own circumstances at that time and hence any such activity which might have occurred in isolated circumstances were local incidents which reflected neither the official policy nor the general practice of The Family with regard to sexuality."

THE LITERATURE

"REVOLUTIONARY SEX," MARCH 27TH 1973

This letter contained the following extracts:

"So many children have grown up with the teaching that sex and masturbation and their sexual parts are sinful, when they are perfectly normal, healthful, physical activities.....It's the excess that is the same in anything."

"This mysterious secrecy about sex, of course, inspired our childish curiosity all the more.....I found little girls are fascinated by my own erections and quite as willing to feel them as I was to attempt to explore their more hidden inner recesses! So I had my first intercourse at the early age of 7 which I found very interesting at my little cousin's instigation, she being of the same age."

"Children SHOULD BE TAUGHT, as we try to teach ours, that your body is a beautiful creation of God. Children SHOULD BE TAUGHT that their sexual parts are just as good as the rest of their bodies and that sexual activities, feelings and pleasures are no more evil than eating or any other physical functions or exercise. They SHOULD BE TAUGHT that the evil results are only from their wrong, unlawful or excessive use. THEY SHOULD BE MADE TO UNDERSTAND that normal sex is no more sinful or less healthful than normal eating or drinking....A child's interest in the equivalent parts of the opposite sex is also perfectly normal and natural along their innocent childish investigations of the same out of natural curiosity and SHOULD NOT BE DISCOURAGED, condemned nor punished." (I have added the emphasis to demonstrate early on the falsehood or, taking a more charitable view of it, the naivety of the denials that the early awakening of childhood sexuality was not a matter encouraged by the literature).

"Children SHOULD BE TAUGHT the same: that there is nothing wrong with their bodies, nothing evil about sex...they should also not be prohibited from mutual self examination, experimentation or interplay when playing or sleeping together where legally possible and social and housing conditions permit...but it must be made very clear to your children that such sexual freedom must never be indulged in or practised openly in the presence of visitors, strangers or uninitiated relatives and friends who have not been properly re-educated in the revolutionary sexual freedoms of natural living - in other words you will not be able to indulge in such God given freedoms in the presence of the average systemite or even new disciples or their children or those who have not yet been properly educated in the liberal loving ways of God's revolutionary naturist...Otherwise, have fun and enjoy the pleasures that God has created and the senses and feelings he has made for you to enjoy WHERE, WHEN AND WITH WHOM possible and expedient remembering the scriptures' own admonition that all of these things may be lawful to you, but they are not always expedient or advisable under all circumstances anywhere with anybody at any time....Don't overdo it, or you may be sorry! On the other hand don't under do it either by denying yourself the joys and necessities of life that God has created for you to enjoy....Don't go to the opposite extreme or permit your children to do so by becoming so addicted to sex and masturbation that you sit around all day starry-eyed like a zombie....From personal experience I can tell you I have accomplished much more and done much greater things and achieved greater success in God's work since I have become more sexually liberated and enjoyed greater sexual activity than ever before.

CHILD BRIDES - 4TH APRIL 1977.

There he wrote:-

"I hope all our young kids have plenty of sex....Why did the Lord make you able to have children at the age of 11, 12 and 13 if you weren't supposed to have sex then?...In India they had child brides at 7 years of age! They can get married at that age! Then they could do all the fucking they want without having to worry about any kids till they are 12 years old!"

"MY CHILDHOOD SEX" - JUNE 1977

This was the authoritative work which would have been read by everyone in The Family.

"God intended for us to get accustomed to sex long before there was any procreation or sexual intercourse. And therefore you wouldn't be so preoccupied with it when you finally hit puberty or somewhere near there and you wouldn't just go crazy about it. If you were already accustomed to it, there wouldn't be any big deal about it, nothing rude. It's only natural!...."

"At 12 I was already fucking."

"I can remember at the age of 4 I was very very interested in little girls and what they looked like down there. I wanted to examine them and most of them seemed to like having me examine them, if we could get away with it when no adults were around, and play doctor and nurse. (Sara: That proves how sexy the Holy Spirit really is! because you were filled with the Holy Spirit from your mother's womb, yet as far back as you can remember you were always interested in girls and sex and Davidito has your spirit and he's the same way!). Fascinated and why not? Sex is a creation of God, created for us all to enjoy! Even children!"

He set out in the letter (or the parts of it we have) how he endeavoured to have sexual intercourse with his seven year old cousin and how at the age of 12 he again tried to have sexual intercourse with a girl of the same age. The letter concluded:

"That's the secret: just let kids do what comes naturally! Don't make a big fuss about it! Just treat it as natural as it is, no big thing, no catastrophe! Just let it come naturally and pleasantly, and explain that that's the way God made us and he wants us to enjoy it and it is perfectly normal and good for you! But you don't do it in public or too much! It's a private pleasure! Amen!"

THE DAVIDITO BOOK

This was printed chapter by chapter before before published as a whole. Among the chapters are these:

1. In Chapter 31 when Davidito was 17 months old in July 1976: I have already recited that passage of Davidito watching the couple make love in the pool and of his being jealous when Alfred and Sara "love up". The Chapter continued:-

"He finally found something he thinks the baby is good for - he climbs up on the bed when she is propped there on a pillow and crawls right on top of her and began hunching away! They both love it, really!"

This baby was Davida, Sara's daughter, who would have been about 3 months old. The chapter continued:

"Mommy and Daddy just didn't believe us until they watched themselves one time: he climbed on top of Davida lying on the couch and began banging away again with a big smile! Daddy stood there, at first a bit awed, then felt Davidito's little penie and said, "I never would have believed it if I didn't really feel how hard he really is!"

2. In chapter 45 when Davidito was 2 years 4 months old, comment was added to Sara's entries by Berg himself. The fact that his views are recorded makes it difficult for The Family to distance him from responsibility for its publication. He said:

"God made children able to enjoy sex so he must have expected them to! I did! All my life! Thank God! I love it! and it didn't hurt me any! Nearly all kids do anyhow, despite prohibitions! And the only reason the system frowns on it is the churches have taught sex as evil! which is contrary to the Bible! how could God create a sexual enjoyment be a sin?! The system is really screwed up! God help us! They're the ones not normal! But "let not your good be evil-spoken of"! So take it easy."

3. In Chapter 61 when Davidito is 3 years 2 months old there was the description the "come-union" and it continued:-

"Soon afterwards in our next location he made up for loss time with his favourite playmate Davida. He told me, "Sarah gonna have to teach Davida to like to fuck and not push me away!" Well, I am glad she does not push him away all time, because the very next night I could not find them after dinner, but spotted right at the top of the stairs! Banging away on each other! Imagine! It's a good thing she liked it that time!"

4. The index is interesting. There is a cartoon of Berg saying:

"Davidito, do you know what you are doing? you are teaching the whole world how to take care of babies!"

There followed a very detailed index including a number of references to sex experiences and education, in addition to the entries on masturbation and penis. There is a cartoon. It shows Davidito on top of Davida as if having sexual intercourse with her.

5. These collected essays were published in 1982 as if then to give current force to the recommended practice in The Family's own Child Care Manual on how to bring up their children.

There are some letters from members of The Family which are revealing about the sexual goings-on within The Family. Thus for example:-

(a) "Sex should be Fun" written in about 1980 when Shuly wrote how "wonderful" it was "to have the liberty if you want it." She goes openly proclaimed that when she was thirteen in Venezuela she had a sexual affair with Berg's grandson.

(b) In "The Blessings of Older Children" written in about 1981 Seek and Secundus observed that they had not heard many testimonies from other families about how fast their kids were maturing, but would be very interested to hear more. Their eldest were Jason 9, Shera 8 and Summer 6. Thew wrote:-

"Jason, Shera and Summer have quite a little love triangle going and have been teaching us a lot about sharing and being unselfish. One night I knew Shera was looking forward to being with Jason, but he was with Summer. I asked Shera about it and she said that Summer was a little discouraged and Jason was trying to cheer her up before he came to bed with her....Jason was so in love with one sister while we were in Finland and really went through trials when he knew a particular older brother was sleeping with her....We really don't encourage or discourage the children about sex but we like to talk to them about what they are experiencing. It really isn't a joke for them, but comes very naturally and matter of factly, and they don't hesitate to share with us without even a flush. We don't know how much flesh brothers and sisters can share when they are older? But we want to share our experiences and are interested in the experiences of others in the family."

TEEN SEX

This was written in September 1985. It began with a comparison between system children and Family children and then Berg said:-

"But in The Family I think we are a very good example

f what parents should be like, TEACHING KIDS what's right and about the Lord and to follow him and his principles and his Law of Love and his rules and getting them reared up in the way they should go so that when they are old they will not depart therefrom".

I again add the emphasis in order to refute The Family's case that the teachings of Mo were not encouraging of any sexuality. I find this this was a clear instruction to the family to school their children in the Law of Love. He pointed out that:

"Our subteens are more like real adults. They are mature enough to get married and have children of their own at an early age which is the way God intended for things to be." Then he continued:

"Of course it is shocking and horrifying to the system but you know how I feel about it! Frankly, I think as children, before the girls start menstruating and the boys start seminating, that's their opportunity to have all the sex they want with no problems - AS LONG AS THE SYSTEM DOESN'T KNOW IT (I have added the emphasis). "And to get their experience and that's the way God intended for it to be! He didn't let them be able to have children until he thought they were old enough to take care of them. And apparently God thought they ought to be old enough and smart enough and responsible enough to take care of them at the ages of 13 and 14!... but up until that age there is no damage they could do having all the freedom they want in exploring each other and HAVING WHATEVER SEX THEY CAN MANAGE TO HAVE! Frankly, that's my opinion. I DON'T KNOW IF WE'RE EVER ABLE TO PUBLISH THAT," (again my emphasis) because that is what the system is horrified at already! They call it "child sex" and all that kind of stuff. But actually the Lord made children so they are interested in it and they enjoy it with each other and they like to explore and have adventures! He made them able to enjoy it at those younger ages and they can even have orgasms".

Maria realised the potential problems with the system and observed that "worldwide protection of children has swept the world" which, for Berg, was "the devil's kind of protection." They laid down rules that:-

"Boys with semen are going to have to avoid fucking girls who menstruate. There are plenty of other kinds of sex they can enjoy even with each other without actually fucking."

The language is so crudely explicit that it becomes thoroughly distasteful, a fact which World Services must have accepted because in their History of the Sexual Policies of The Family compiled in November 1993, they quote this passage using the more delicate euphemism "making love"!

"QUESTIONS YOU ALWAYS WANTED TO ASK."

This was published at about the time of or shortly after the Teen Training Camp in 1986. The teens had submitted their questions in advance, the leaders had answered them and "Dad was able to look them over and add some comments."

Question 1 was "What are the rules regarding sex for a 15 year old, as well as for younger teens?"

"Answer: Here's what Dad and Maria say that can help clarify that from the letter Teen Sex, paragraph 36: "(Maria: for the sake of potential problems with the system, we have set a rule for our girls that they can't fuck a seminating male after starting their period till they are 15). Yes, now you are making the qualification as I said, I think there is no reason to discourage them from having sex with each other until the girls begin to menstruate and the boys begin to seminate...Man's laws are in violation of God's laws, and because of this, we just have to be careful with our revolutionary living and our radical ideas and

our liberties and freedoms, which the system doesn't have and sometimes doesn't tolerate. So boys and girls, you can have all the sex you want within the guidelines of counselling with your shepherds and/or parents, but boys, once you start having semen, you should not fuck any girls who have started their periods and are under the age of 15 years old. Once a teen girl starts her periods she must refrain from actual fucking with any boys who have semen because then you could produce a baby....Its o.k. to fuck boys who do not yet have semen, and girls, once you've reached your 15th birthday, you can go ahead and fuck.

Question 2 the teens always apparently wanted to ask was:

"Once girls have stated their period, can they still have dates with teen boys with semen and masturbate each other, even though they can't fuck? Answer: As long as they are obedient to The Family rule that Grandpa and Maria set down and don't fuck, yes, it would be fine to love and satisfy each other with kissing, masturbating etc...Our dear king and queen are entrusting you teens with this blessing and great responsibility of having teen sex. They of course want you to be happy and enjoy and love each other but they also want you to obey.

"Make it Work" written in June 1988 laid down a new policy which became necessary after the introduction of the "school vision" in November 1987 and the creation of Family schools which called for a more clearly defined code of sexual conduct for the teenagers. It may be a fair inference that control had to be imposed over the excessive enjoyment of the freedoms granted to the teenagers. Perhaps The Family had in mind the excesses revealed in the "Heavenly City School Training Seminar Notes" which The Family subsequently sought to suppress. EM was a leading figure at this school and she and two others report on the teens relationships/sharing. They decided:

"To have a sharing plan which was an experiment. We patterned it after the adult sharing plan and were careful not to push anyone onto it - no pressureAlmost all the boys wanted to be on it, but not many of the girls, so some of the older girls took two boys!...we were trying to teach the teen to have unselfish love, not pressure them."

Consider that for a moment! Here was the flagship of The Family School Vision teaching the children to have unselfish love, teaching them in other words to submit to sexual intercourse. To continue:-

"We had the schedule for about 1 to 1 1/2 months. It was only about 10 couples and then it went down to two girls and some boys! Then we asked what their hang ups were about the sharing plan, what you like and do not like about it. We cancelled it for a while to have classes and pow wows about it...They had really honest and sincere questions that needed to be answered and it was a huge victory in that area. They had to overcome the things about being cruel....They had to learn it as "cool" in God's eyes to be on fire...The fruit was all of them wanted to be on the sharing plan! So then we had to have ...two classes and share with them what to do if you aren't going all the way. A girl asked if you could get pregnant from sucking and swallowing it or pregnant without the man coming in etc. They needed the practical classes too and it was amazing all the things they did not know that we took for granted a lot. They don't have the experience we do AND HAVEN'T READ THE LETTERS THAT WE KNEW." (I add the emphasis to show how the Letters had shaped this intelligent lady's behaviour and how she clearly wished to use them to instruct her young charges in sexual practices.) "You really could see some of them really didn't know what we were talking about. It is important to take time to discuss the birds and bees and explain these things! We

end to take it for granted that they know about sex but they don't. They need the word on it read to them... Some guidelines were laid down to help them learn these values and responsibilities in their lives and to count the cost. They could go all the way but if the girl got pregnant, they would need to get married to the Daddy and they would also have to leave the school and go to another field with the mate where it is more acceptable for a teen girl to be pregnant. They were quite sobered. The boys especially really valued their place here and didn't want to lose it and almost all said, "I'm not going to fuck" because they really wanted to stay. The girls were happy to hear they wouldn't be pregnant and left on their own - then the girls went through the trials that the boys wouldn't fuck - the tables had turned! Hang Ups: we haven't had any major problems along the line of sharing, love and relationships since our classes except for some new teens who came in and missed it and were a bit fleshed out which we had to stop as they would sometimes dissemble. Some girls wouldn't undress anywhere except in a corner and were really bound and not free at all. Example of shower problem - in Japan you shower together...but in some cases some boys and girls didn't want the opposite sex in the shower. Some boys and some girls would shower with their undies on even with their own sex. We brought it out and discussed it and it improved. We found that many teens feel awkward or embarrassed about their body even though they have been raised in the family and with our liberties etc." (I am not surprised The Family attempted to suppress this document!) "Talk with them. Try to show them from the word. We had a bra discussion as they were all wearing them and we had to show them from the word why not to wear it. But if they needed it or were big or their breasts hurt, it was fine and o.k. Some girls were really just wearing them out of rebellion, except that they were rebelling in the opposite way than we did as teens - by wearing bras! Now we are having to ask them to wear bras more sometimes for visitors etc. You have to explain everything so they know the whys and wherefores." (Deceivers yet true, I ask?)

Marriage Prep Vision! Inspiring vision! The latest counsel we got was that our goal we could teach the teens was Marriage Prep. It was brought out that the system rarely fails to prepare teens for marriage. But we could teach them lots about this! The sharing plan seemed to feed shallowness in relationships and the teens were missing having to grow up mature. We were promoting promiscuity"- a startling admission from a teacher, even if she immediately added - " which is completely off the channel to the letters. We were not promoting what Dad is saying in the letters. Marriage prep was Dad's answer to all the info we sent in about this subject! We now need to teach them about relationship and loving dedication and responsibility to mates, why we bring people together in the first place. This Counsel changed the spirit among the teens."

EM stands condemned by her own words that she was promoting promiscuity. It was a deplorable abuse of adolescent children. It may even be that Berg would have agreed with me. He wrote in the "Make it Work" letter:-

"Now beloved, I realise we are a very sexy Family and we believe in sex but you've got to watch out! It only takes one little discontented miscreant, one little offended backslider who wants to justify himself for backsliding and makes that his complaint: "They promoted teen sex"! Isn't that the kind of story that someone might say, considering the way some of our schools and homes have apparently allowed their teens to have too much freedom and too many liberties? Where did you ever find in any of the letters that I have advocated complete sexual freedom among teenagers? Don't start quoting me Child Brides.

There's only one thing that letter advocates in the way of young teenagers having sex, and what is it? (Fam: Marriage.) "Where did The Family get the idea that I promoted and advocated teenage promiscuity? (Fam: They just know that we are very free sexually. Even as little kids they slept with their brothers and sisters, and not only just physical brothers and sisters, but other kids, and they've played around. They've just grown up with it for 15 years in The Family, it just sort of comes natural). I think in my letters you will find what I consider the solution to the teens need for sex - and you will find it particularly in the letter on Child Brides. In that letter I am not advocating teenagers playing around with sex, but I am trying to prove that God intended for young teenagers, not just older teenagers, but even young teenagers to have sex, yes, but as married couples!" (He seemed to have forgotten about Teen Sex and the answers to the children's questions.)

"I very revolutionarily asked you why do you think God allows young teenagers to have semen and periods and to be able to have babies if he did not intend for them to do so? What I was trying to teach you was that it is the ideal time for them to have sex, to couple up, have babies and therefore become mothers and fathers under the direct supervision and tutelage and control of their elders."

(I interpolate that it is not what he was saying, he was giving them permission to have sexual intercourse until boys began to produce semen and girls began to menstruate. Thereafter they were to refrain from sexual intercourse until 15, although they were free to engage in masturbation, and if the Heavenly City School is any example, to engage also in oral masturbation.) Berg then laid down the new law in these terms:-

"And I want to tell you right now, I want to set myself on record in black and white right now, that I am not in favour of teenage promiscuity, sexual freedom, but I am in favour of encouraging teenage MARRIAGES! Do you hear that? Marriages! Fatherhood, Motherhood, babyhood, loyalty, faithfulness of mates, responsibility, duty, obligation! Just as much as the system is, if not more....so my answer to your teenage sex problem is not promiscuity, it is marriage! That's what I've ALWAYS said and always encouraged and I haven't changed a bit! I am just shocked that people have misinterpreted me other ways."

I find without hesitation that his self righteous delusion that he has been misrepresented is pure humbug. I have no hesitation either in finding that The Family have endeavoured to stamp upon teenage sexual activity and have since 1988 firmly and categorily laid down rules for the young in The Family.

In September 1989 in the letter "Teen Marriage Rules! - More on how to make it work!" (a letter I do not recall having seen, save for an extract provided by World Services) rules were laid down for teenagers wishing to marry to make a commitment for the rest of their lives, that the match should have parental approval and the approval of the leadership, that the teens should go steady for 6 months and then become betrothed and that they should live together for at least 6 months before being allowed to marry. More detailed guidelines were established, qualified and presented to The Family in 1991 and published in the Latest News Flash in August of that year, again a document I have not seen. These rules were published in August 1991 and apply today. They are as follows:-

"Pre-teens, ages 11, 12 and 13 are not allowed to date. They can have sex classes as part of their scholastic training. Junior teens, aged 14 and 15, can begin a marriage prep course as part of their scholastic training. At aged 15 and 9 months they can begin a six month going steady or engagement period, but no

sex is allowed. Senior teens aged 16 and 17 can have sexual contact 3 months after engagement, with the person they are engaged to. Marriage is possible at 16, after a 6 month engagement so long as it is legal in the country of current residency. Young adults, aged 18, 19 and 20 are allowed to make sexual contact with each other without being married. Such contact must be approved by the home team work. This is completely voluntary. Whether they choose to have sexual intercourse or not in their sexual relationship is up to them."

No adult members over the age of 21 can engage in any sexual activity with those under 21." (It may be that on reaching 21, they may be allowed to continue an on-going relationship with someone under that age).

THE ORAL EVIDENCE ABOUT THE SEXUAL ACTIVITY OF CHILD WITH CHILD, AND AMONG THE TEENAGERS.

I accept the generality of the evidence presented to me that there was widespread activity of that kind to an extent significantly greater than would take place between children and between teenagers outside The Family. I confine myself to some particular findings of fact which appear to be more material than others.

1. MB: I have already referred to her being required to stroke and fondle her friend A1 as they danced for the sexual pleasure of the men at MWM. For the purposes of the behaviour I am dealing with, I must refer to her evidence of the time when she was living in her grandfather's house. She was there with Maria's children Davidito some 3 years younger and Techii about 6 years younger. She joined them when she was aged about 11. Davidito was about 8. From an early stage she had "sexual foreplay with him and took it as perfectly natural." "Davidito was quite experienced in sexual matters". MB lived in the Berg compound for nearly 4 years. The end of her time there included some of the most painful periods in her life as I shall have to recount. Because she was being beaten, there were many things that she was "blocking out", but she told me, and I accept, that she specifically remembers that Sara "came and told me that grandfather wanted me to become pregnant by Davidito", "who was less than 12 by then". That was her first experience of full sexual intercourse. Sara wrote in the "Last State" (Mar 1987) that "MB was having regular dates with Dito and we suggested she put off these interests in other boys and sex except Dito, until she was much stronger in the Lord". I find that at least Berg, Maria and Sara connived at that activity and I have little doubt that it was common knowledge in the compound and therefore within the knowledge of the other leaders who acquiesced in its occurrence.

When MB went to Macau she spoke of there being considerable sexual activity between the teenagers before the Make It Work letter was published. The contradiction between this letter and the earlier letters was obvious to the teenagers, many of whom were confused and some of whom (though not many) continued clandestinely to behave as they had.

2. AB spoke of the teenagers being given "an hour in the basement for the enjoyment of their sexual pleasures".

3. JG is the son of Apollos, also known as Pathway, the editor of the many letters and co-author with Berg of "Heaven's Girl". He began a full sexual life at an early age and was having his first full sexual intercourse at the age of 10. He continued it with his contemporaries and in Macau was frustrated when this was discouraged. I accepted his evidence despite finding him to be somewhat coarse and disrespectful and seemingly contemptuous of authority. I was not surprised that such a

personality caused him to be in trouble within The Family. I regret that I could not accept the evidence of his elder brother EG, who wished to play down the significance of sexual activity between the teenagers themselves.

4. KJ. She was a very important witness. Her father is CJ, known in the family as Simon Peter. He has a position of high leadership. Her mother is VJ who is now vociferous in her condemnation of The Family and is much involved in the media campaign whose purpose is to expose them and bring them down. KJ herself has not fought shy of publicity. It is, therefore important that I scrutinize her evidence closely before accepting it to be true. It was given over nearly 4 days. As I look back at my notes, especially of my contemporaneous comments, I see how time and time again I was impressed with the wealth of detail which came pouring out in a way which did not suggest either invention or the recounting of the experiences of others. There were too many occasions when she was given the opportunity to embellish facts to the disadvantage of The Family and refrained from doing so. She gave credit where credit was due, for example, to SF. At one point she broke down and denounced Berg in tones of such obvious deep personal anguish that I caused the tape recording of that part of her evidence to be made available and I played it back at one point during the hearing. It was not suggested that her distress was a theatrical display skilfully presented to deceive me. Her evidence stood in some contrast to that of another of the Plaintiff's witnesses, RD, who from time to time did descend into unconvincing histrionics. KJ spoke of the early sexual exploration in which she engaged as a very young child. She said that from the youngest age she knew that she and members of The Family were special but she went on to describe how, at the age of 4 or 5, she visited her grandparents who are not members of The Family. She recalled her grandmother crying because she had seen KJ and her brother under the table engaged in this kind of childish exploration and fumbling. It was then that KJ realised that they were different because they, members of The Family, had the gift of God to do all these things because they had broken the bondage of the world and were free. She had her first full sexual intercourse at the age of about 7 with a boy of about 12 in a house in India which had beds and she could remember to mosquito nets. She had experience of simulated sex before then. She had no sense of doing it furtively although she did not like to be teased as occasionally she was along the lines of, "Oh you're going to be a good Ffer" or "Oh, wow, how cute, how unselfish". She subsequently had full sexual intercourse with a number of boys and engaged in "foreplay or masturbation" with many others. She said she moved around a lot and everywhere she went she experienced it and could not remember any particular home where more or less took place. She spoke of sharing with SC and FC. This was kissing, cuddling, masturbating and simulating sex in their bunk beds. She was about 7 or 8 at the time. Later, just before her departure from India in March 1988, a few months short of her 12th birthday, she said that she and SC, of whom she appeared to have been fond, renewed their sexual contact, engaged in masturbation, but on this occasion had full sexual intercourse. She spoke of his ejaculating almost immediately and of semen running down her legs. SC spoke of "climbing on top of her and jumping up and down and having an orgasm," which he said was his first but he denied that it was "penetrative sex". It seems to me more likely than not that he did penetrate, however briefly. KJ says that after her return to this country she discovered that she was pregnant and miscarried. I accept that she did but I am far from certain that SC was responsible for that pregnancy, having regard to her

admitted sexual intercourse with another boy in the weeks before her leaving India.

5. SC did admit that there were times when he had cuddled her, he admitted that he used to jump into KJ's bed when they were in tents at a teen camp and he admitted cuddling but was unconvincing when he said that it was only the others who could have been "exploring each other sexually". He very modestly admitted that the girls were keen on him and he became interested in girls when he was about 12 which would have preceded KJ's departure from India. He admitted that he had sexual intercourse with SW when both were aged 13 and he described this as his first "full" sexual relationship. Given the fleeting nature of his encounter with KJ, that is probably so. Whilst he denied living in a highly sexualized atmosphere, he had heard of the rumours about MP having sex with other boys, in particular K1 and he was aware of older teenagers who had "got into trouble over sexual matters". By the time he was 13 the rules had changed and it could then be said that sex was discouraged, but not enough to prevent his experience with SW. I was impressed by much of what he told me until right at the end of his evidence he was cross examined about his failing to tell the truth to the Australian barrister making his film in Denmark. He did not tell the truth, he said, because of his embarrassment and his not wanting to explain why he had been put on silence and why he was a "rotten apple". To some extent he is embarrassed by his young sexual experiences and I believe he is seeking to diminish them.

6. His brother FC was of a very different personality. He has none of his young brother's charm. He was a most unconvincing witness and I did not feel that I could rely upon him. SF their mother was a nice woman as almost all who knew her agreed. I do not find it at all unlikely that, as MP told me, she, SF, allowed MP and K1 to have "cuddle time", made a room available and even placed the candle in the room for its romantic effect. I am equally satisfied that although SF condoned heavy petting, she discouraged sexual intercourse but MP and K1 disobeyed her. She liked KJ as KJ liked her. I am sure she was distressed for FC who was so much less popular than SC. She was a little insulated from the full effect of the sexual letters and just as her sons were surprised by her topless dancing, so she was surprised by the sexual activity of the young which occurred under her roof. Because she is such a nice lady, she wanted to believe the best in everyone and to some extent she had shut her eyes to what had been going on about her.

7. The P Family

Because they have been so heavily involved in the media campaign against The Family, I initially viewed their evidence with some scepticism. MP was particularly aggressive in the way she gave evidence. Her language was deliberately crude and she seemed as determined to paint as a perverted picture as SF was to view life through rose coloured spectacles. The truth lies somewhere in between these two extremes. In fairness to SF, I should not overlook VP's evidence that SF discouraged her from a close relationship with a boy aged 13 or 14. In order to put in perspective a false picture of rampant sexual activity enjoyed all the time by all the teenagers, I must bear in mind that VP herself remained aloof from this activity though she was, of course, a good bit younger than some of the others. She also made the point that practices varied from place to place. Mexico, where they went after India, was "quite loose and people did what they wanted." When she went to Wantage, about which more later, she was rebuked for holding hands which she found strange because there was so much sex around when she was young.

8. A striking confirmation of the fact that The Family's attitude to child sexuality was very different from "the system's" came from the evidence of MA who told me very frankly, and therefore to his credit, that he and his wife were approached by a couple who had been in Greece (where even The Family tacitly acknowledged excesses occurred) and who suggested that their son aged 10 should share with their daughter of the same age, an invitation which the MA's rejected, apparently to the other couple's surprise.

9. DR, as fervent a supporter of The Family as one could find, slipped into her evidence, self righteously, I thought, that there was an occasion aged 11 when a boy of the same age wanted to have sexual intercourse with her and was disconcerted by her refusal. What was unconsciously revealing of this incident was her adding that he rebuked her for being selfish, just as Berg denounced all refusals to give sexual pleasure, the message of "The Girl who Wouldn't".

CONCLUSION:

Not all children were engaged in sexual activity but far too many were. That was directly the result of growing up within the "sexy Family". For those used to that freedom, they had a considerable difficulty in adjusting to the restrictions that were imposed upon them in 1988. Some continued to enjoy the freedom notwithstanding the ban. I am satisfied that since then The Family have been so concerned to refute the allegations of child abuse that the children now grow up sexually more conservative than many of their contemporaries in the system. I cannot find that S is at any greater risk of experiencing untimely inappropriate sexual contact with other children.

CHILD/ADULT SEX

THE ISSUES JOINED BETWEEN THE PARTIES

In her answer designed to clarify the issues in this case, the defendant pleaded that The Family had never encouraged sexual activity between adults and children; that the sentiments expressed in "My Little Fish", though unacceptable, were written by Sara before the establishment of The Family and that it did not represent Family policy, which is to excommunicate any member guilty of sexual abuse of a child. On attempt being made further to clarify this, the following admissions were formally made at a hearing for directions:-

"For the purposes of the Wardship proceedings regarding S, the senior leadership of The Family acknowledges and admits that:-

a) Father David taught, and it was and is generally accepted in The Family, that sex and sexual activity as God prescribed is a natural God-given aspect of creation and human make-up.

b) Notwithstanding the existence of a large number of Family members who would never have tolerated any inappropriate sexual contact between adults and minors, prior to 1986 - there was within The Family an over-simplistic and naive attitude concerning the sexuality of developmentally and emotionally immature children

c) that there were some instances of children having sexually inappropriate contact with adults and being exposed to inappropriate adult sexuality."

2. The Family denies that:

a) Such behaviour was ever institutionalised or

b) Was Family policy or

c) Was representative of the norm within The Family

homes

3. It is denied that such inappropriate conduct was

either widespread, encouraged or endemic.

4. In or about 1986 evidence came to the attention of the senior leadership that there had been instances of inappropriate sexual conduct between adults and teenagers, and the leadership took immediate action to prevent any further abuse by clearly stating that The Family did not agree with such behaviour and that it was not permitted."

THE LITERATURE

"REVOLUTIONARY SEX," MARCH 1973.

This had the early assertion that, "All things are lawful unto us" and the message was that any act done in love was lawful as far as God was concerned. Berg asked whether masturbation was not one of the prohibited sexual offences and referred to his mother slapping their poor little Mexican maid out of the house when Berg was only 3 years old when his mother caught the maid putting him to sleep "in this pleasant fashion" (by oral masturbation) "a common practice among many other more primitive cultures." He recounted his earlier attempts at sexual intercourse at the age of 7 as I have already set out. He then learnt that the Bible apparently had absolutely nothing to say about masturbation and evidently nothing against it except the unusual admonition "to be temperate in all things." He went on to state that children should be taught that their body was a beautiful creation of God and that sex was not sinful. The revolutionary message of the letter was "go ahead and masturbate and/or fuck with all your might and thank God for it." It was a letter clearly designed to break down acknowledged taboos. It was the beginning of the process of sexualizing children.

LITTLE GIRL DREAM, OCTOBER 1976

This showed a drawing of Berg in a bed in church, Maria on one side and a little girl on the other, her hand on his penis. In the text of the letter he wrote:-

"This beautiful dark haired little girl of about 10 or 11 came and crawled in bed with me! She lay half on top of me although on her back and she laid her hand behind right down on top of my genitals and across my right leg.... I thought to myself, "Well, how tempting can you get!" She looked like she really wanted me to make love to her but I certainly didn't want to do it in front of all these people especially since she was so young....I was very concerned about what they would think. It was bad enough for her to be in bed with me all naked, all of us naked under the cover without actually going at it!....Here's this young girl who wants my love, but I was afraid to give it to her because of what people, systemite church people obviously, might say. That is, of course, our greatest risk here, incurring the wrath of the church and the system in loving this new little church that is springing up with such fervour and zeal and witnessing ardour, that is so very much on fire for the Lord through our FF witnessing here (Tenerife). How are we winning this new little church? We are winning it with our love both spiritually and sexually so that is very significant...It was almost like she was deliberately trying to get me to make love to her so that she could bear fruit, which certainly this young church is doing here right now."

Even if this is an allegory for his new church, the illustration is horridly explicit. The message could, therefore, just as easily be understood to be that just as it was permissible for the young church of the Children of God to defy the conventions of the established churches, so that it was permissible for a young child to have some sexual contact in bed with an old man.

"MY CHILDHOOD SEX" - JUNE 1977

He reminded his readers about his Mexican baby sitter when he was 3 and he said:-

"I think I was in love with that little Mexican girl, she was wonderful, she really made me happy! She used to suck me to sleep for my nap every afternoon. I loved it! But my mother began to get curious....I wasn't any little angel, I was just waiting to get sucked! I had orgasms and really enjoyed it. I always got nice and relaxed and went to sleep right after. So I got started liking sex at an early age. But my mother was not very progressive....I don't know what was naughty about it. I enjoyed it! It worked! Look at me, I don't think it did me any harm! Of course if you'd ask any of my enemies, they'd say, "Ah Ha, see! that's what made him such a sex maniac!"...It just stands to reason that if it feels good at that age, then the Lord intended for kids to get used to feeling good with sex. If they can even have an orgasm at that age, he intended for them to be able to have an orgasm and enjoy it! Why not? What's evil about an orgasm?" This revolutionary policy statement must have caused some stir when it was published and re-published 14 months later in August 1978. Berg's daughter, Faithy, wrote her reaction to it in these terms:-

"CHILDHOOD SEX: I like it! It reminded me of how you used to put me to sleep when I was a little girl, 3 or 4. Wow! Daddy did it best! Back rubbin' that is, and front rubbin' too!...Daddy just made me feel good all over and I didn't know why, but it would really put me to sleep with a sigh! Praise the Lord! I don't think it perverted me, none at all, but it sure converted me to his call! SO I BELIEVE OUR PARENTS SHOULD TRY IT""and help our kids to get the natural habit! We pray it'll work, then junior won't be a sexual jerk! It worked for me as you can see, I just do what comes naturally! Oh I could write a book, but this is just a look into my childhood sex!" (My emphasis yet again to point out (1) that Family literature for which the leadership is entirely responsible here exhorts The Family to try "front rubbin', which can only mean masturbation, and (2) that the example they are urged to follow is that of their beloved leader touching his 3 or 4 year old daughter in a way ordinary good parents know they find utterly repellant. What should it tell them about David Berg? What responsibility does this now cast on Maria and Peter Amsterdam to "pow-wow" these questions?

At the same date as Childhood Sex, The Family published "UNCIRCUMCISION". In what might have been a helpful discussion on the subject of whether or not to circumcise boys, Berg could resist adding sexual comment such as his advice to the men to wash their penis "if you want the girls to play with it, especially if you want them to suck it!"

He gave this advice for dealing with young children:

"Try putting a little baby oil or vaseline on it to lubricate it real good before pulling the foreskin down. The mucus of your mouth is a good lubricant too! And he'll love it!...It's so much better to gradually stretch it by slowly working it down by hand in love and patience - and lots of fun...knowing my mother's attitude towards sex, I don't presume that appealed to her much, but I began to enjoy the treatment as it loosened up! Hallelujah!"

THE DAVIDITO BOOK

This was first printed in a series of letters from about 1975 to 1981 and then reprinted in 1982. In the letter "The Advantages of Having Children" May 1978, Berg explained how when Maria became pregnant, they discovered there was no childcare ministry and so they obtained whatever literature they

needed and decided they did not like it "because it was not the way we believed in rearing kids!" It seems that Davidito had started the childcare revolution. Berg wrote:-

"You can throw a lot of that old stuff out! We're writing a whole new childcare series called The Davidito Series. Maria was wondering why she had to get pregnant and have a baby. She couldn't see any good reason for it at all, but look what happened! God knew why! Amen? PLT! Davidito was to become an example to the world and inspire" lots of childcare material! Thank God!"

Berg was, in my judgment, quite clear giving his approval to whatever was being written and he was assuming responsibility for it. It is naive of The Family to seek to distance the leadership from this book and cast the sole blame upon Sara. In their original answer filed in this case, that is exactly what they sought to do.

The book contained these passages:-

a) Learning fun at 20 months, October '76.

"Sex! he gets quite excited when I wash his bottom and his penie gets real big and hard. I kiss it all over till he gets so excited he bursts into laughter and spreads his legs open for more. I wonder what it's going to be like when he begins to talk and asks me for more? When playing on the floor he's often times spread his legs open for me to kiss his penis (what we call his penie). He got to where he liked it so much he'd pull people by the hand down onto the floor and would spread his legs apart for "the treatment" so we had to explain to him that there are a lot more important things in life than just sex, and for a time and place for everything!" (I note that this chapter appeared at the same time as "Little Girl Dream.")

b) At the age of 2 years and 3 months Davidito is taken to a brothel and in the early hours one of the girls "gave a special little show for Davidito with her gyrations and heavy breathing, running her hands over her body, really turning everybody on".

c) In Bed Bugs, May 1977 with Davidito 2 years 4 months. Sara wrote:-

"Sex! Now if I share with you some of Davidito's sexy experiences, will you try prayerfully and cautiously to benefit from the lessons learned and follow the Lord's leadings in possibly sharing the same kind of gentle love and fun, without stumbling our little sheep? Sex is a beautiful God-given wonderful part of life we enjoy together and we would love to share it with you as long as you don't use it as "an occasion to the flesh" and in some way that could actually harm or confuse the children. It is often times the little ones who suffer through our big people mistakes." (In other words, provided you do it in love, the child will not suffer harm or confusion - a thesis that Dr. Heller, NT's own expert, roundly deprecates.) "So we'll attempt to share a few of our experiences with you, not so that you will try to do exactly what we do," (then why on earth tell them this sordid little encounter?) "but because it's part of little David's life story, praise the Lord. On 28th April after nap time Alfred, Davidito and I were all three loving up, when Dito looked at me with those big dreamy canary black eyes and said, "Sarah I yub you". He pulled me down to kiss him, then pushed my head down to kiss some more! It all developed so gently and lovingly that he was really affectionate, eyes closed, so guess what happened? For a bouncing climax (ha), he spoke out in excited foreign tongues! He sounded so very happy....afterwards he lay still in my arms to rest....now often when we lay on the bed together....he'll put his arm around me and say, "Sarah, love me up big".

That letter cannot be interpreted otherwise than Sara kissing the boys penis and the boy later simulating sexual

intercourse with her as is shown in one of the pictures. To that Berg added this comment, again an indication of his participation in the writing of this book and his approval of it:

"God made children able to enjoy sex so he must have expected them to. I did! All my life! Thank God! I love it! And it didn't hurt me any! Nearly all kids to anyhow despite prohibitions! And the only reason the system frowns on it is that the churches have taught sex as evil! Which is contrary to the Bible! How could God have created sexual enjoyment to be a sin? The system is really screwed up! God help us! They're the ones not normal! But let not your good be evil spoken of! So take it easy!"

(d) At 2 yrs 7 months Sara wrote:-

"Dito and I loved up together after our bath! Ha! What a revolutionary life we do lead!"

The photograph below that passage showed the two of them naked on the bed with Sara fondling the boys penis.

(e) There were some words of caution. In December 1977:-

"And please remember dear Family, that we do not share Davidito's own experiences or lessons with you expecting you to always do the very same thing with your own children. Dad and Maria are hoping to prepare themselves for a very special God appointed mission in life. He is a royal prince...he has matured and grown very fast, much like Dad himself, always ahead of us, who his followers learn from as an example. Of course all our Family children are very special and we have an extremely important mission to fulfil in these latter days we do hope you can apply what lessons you may have learnt from this story in their disciple training. What a wonderful opportunity and blessing that we can all take part in helping to teach God's little children who are so chosen in new fresh vessels the way the truth and the life of Jesus Christ and our shepherd and king David."

As I read that it is more encouraging than discouraging.

(f) In August 1979 the now notorious "My Little Fish" chapter was published. There were citations from Revolutionary Sex and accompanying photographs. They showed, for example, Davidito kissing Sara's breasts and squeezing her nipples, they showed them together naked in bed hugging each other under the caption "Enjoy yourself in what God has given you to enjoy" and in another photograph under a caption "When two shall lie together they shall have heat." The original also had the photograph of Sara sucking the boy's penis above a caption "It's a wonderful relaxation, a satisfaction created by the Lord". At the time it was published, My Childhood Sex, itself published four months earlier, might have been fresh in everyone's mind. That it was outrageously inappropriate seems to be conceded silently by that omission of that photograph when the book was published in 1982.

(g) In March 1978 at aged 3 years 2 months Davidito wandered around watching the copulating couples at the "come-union":

"So next he wanted his turn and as soon as I got into bed he jumped on me and said "Sarah love me". He specifically asked for several swigs of wine, got happy real quick so we really had a good time! Alf, Tim and Mommy were outside the door listening to him. "Sara now kiss it!" and then he began to laugh and laugh. "Oh it flopped in your nose!"...he kept asking for more and more love....We were all really surprised that he took everything so well, since he didn't have a playmate too and is usually very jealous about "sharing" but he waited his turn and was a real good boy."

(h) In April 1978 at 3 years 3 months Sara wrote:

"Sex - (do you find yourself looking for this part to read first? Ha!) Several times while I was gone to Egypt, David mentioned he'd wished I'd hurry home to bed. The day upon my return we had a nice picnic lunch with Alf right by the riverside near our house. David wanted to bring a blanket and a scented candle so that we could make love, but there were too many people around so we didn't quite get to the climax, Ha. But it was a real cute idea. He's so precious! One night when Alf and the cook were kissing and cuddling in the living room on the living room couch, David came into the bedroom and offered me a glass of wine then suggested that we go together into the living room to be with Alf. We sat down and he said, "Have some apply juice," because he's only a little boy and once served then we began to love up too. We got undressed and he got real affectionate, trying to do just what Alf did."

What can this be other than that this 3 year old boy was participating in sexual shenanigans with his nanny?

The book ended with a cartoon of Berg holding Davidito and saying, "Davidito do you know what you're doing? You're teaching the whole world how to take care of babies!"

The leadership must have known and intended that this book be acted upon by The Family. In July 1978 they published in Family News a letter from one of the members who wrote with reference to her new child that she wondered now how these letters were going to become a reality in his life. Had she not been perverted by them?

THE DEVIL HATES SEX. MAY 1980.

This letter was not produced by the Family despite it being called for. Dr Melton had to make it available. It contained these passages:-

(a) "Of course the worst of all sexual sins is with children. "How could you besmirmch and defile and violate your own child? An under-aged minor!". I don't know what the hell age has got to do with it when God made'm able to enjoy it practically from time they are born! But though God didn't want them as under-age to have sexual feelings and sexual responses and sexual nerves and sexual organs from the time they are born, the system prohibits them from having them until they are 18-21 years of age....I mean to teach sexual freedom and sexual liberty as downright dangerous! Look at how the newspapers of Britain have reacted to some of our simple little instructions about how to get the foreskin of your little boy down so that you can wash him! They call that child sex...and I'll tell you it's dangerous because the system sure hates it, and the system's laws and everything are geared against sexual activity of all kinds and types, particularly having anything to do with children! Who don't even have to be a child, just a minor...there's nothing in the world at all wrong with sex as long as its practised in love, whatever it is, or whoever its with, no matter who, or AT WHAT AGE or what relative or in what manner," (I have added the emphasis)" and you don't hardly dare even say these words in private. If the law ever got a hold of this, they'd try to string me up! They'd probably lynch me before I got to the jail."

It is impossible to read that without being certain that Berg had well in mind that his advocating sex with someone at no matter what age, was to advocate sex with children and he rightly appreciated the condemnation that would be heaped upon him when his views became known outside The Family.

He went on :-

"I'm talking about natural normal Godly love as manifested in sex, as far as I am concerned for whomever! There are no relationship restrictions or age limitations in his law of love. But the system and laws make it all against the law...The

system really stinks. It is.... fiendish propaganda against the laws of God and the love of God and the sex of God." (Again my emphasis)

It must have been known to the leadership how the Law of Love was being applied within The Family for he wrote:-

"We are free in our hearts now, we are free in privacy, and that's about all and we mightn't be free if they discovered what we do in private."

Other pieces of evidence of the leadership's knowledge emerge from some of the papers before me.

a) Some time in about 1980 Shuly wrote to World Services. In the letter "Growing Up in the Lord" she referred to her fears of growing up. She wrote:

"I had seen quite a few examples of 'lust', not 'love' like in your letters, so that just about rooted my fear. For 5 long years I had the trial that I'd have to start "sharing" as soon as I was old enough and the devil painted me pictures of horrible hairy guys making a line at the door."

She asked:

"Do you think other teenage girls are going through the trials I was about sharing? It would be interesting to know". She was just 16.

In another letter, "Sex should be fun", she wrote about being

"sad and upset when I read what another teenage girl said about "going thru it" in the area of sexual sharing. It really struck me, because more kids in the family are becoming teenagers and it would be a shame if they had to "go thru it" too. Here's part of a letter I received from a 13 year old girl, a friend of mine, in The Family:

"Well I went thru it at first because it was kind of hard relating to older brothers at about 30 years old when I had just turned 13. And when I started maturing and started to look beautiful the guys they would go around pinching and slapping my butt, squeezing my tits etc., and for me this was a real turn off. It's sort of different when you "share" with someone your own age, you're just having fun and it's easier to relate to each other and open up but with someone twice your age you feel funny with them and you take it more seriously. And sometimes when my parents shared or fell in love with someone, I felt like I was deserted and left along with the kids and this really turned me off sharing and sex. So they thought I wasn't quite as "free" as they were, so they decided to break my hang ups". Shuly then described her affair with Berg's grandson when she was 13. She wrote:-

"Although I am 16 I still don't feel mature enough to have anything to do with a grown man. Maybe it's hard for you to understand but sometimes a grown man can overpower a young girl and dominate her. Having a relationship with Junior cured me of the loathing of sex and a terror of older men due to the effect of an unwise older brother in our home....I think Child Brides is a wonderful letter because some (not all) teenagers really need to have fun with someone their own age group FIRST....Many guys think that just because a young girl had an "experience" that she is "available". If a girl goes thru it as far as sex it's probably because she's being pressured into it, not wanting to appear to be A Girl Who Wouldn't but she just isn't ready for any experience with older brethren or the particular ones in question. Although I've had an experience I would go through trials if I was pressured into sharing with an older guy...I think it's a shame to have to go through trials when sex should be something beautiful. I write because a sad experience could put some people off the wonderful love shared in the family. May God bless and keep you Dad. Your daughter in Jesus. Shuly."

that Berg replied:

"Praise the Lord! God bless you! Amen! We heartily agree! And real love lasts!"

That was an opportunity for Berg to appreciate that young teenagers, as young as 13, were being forced to have sexual relations with older men. It was the opportunity for him to stamp out that practice had he deprecated it. He did not take that opportunity. By his silence he condoned it. His sanctimonious agreement was a reassertion of the principal that if it was done in love it was permissible. He totally failed to take on board that this young girl was pointing out the imbalance of power and the pressure older men by virtue of age alone exerted upon children. He was prescient enough to have recognised in the Law of Love that the freedom was capable of being abused. Here was the evidence that it was being abused. He did nothing to control it. This was a lamentable failure to stamp out the wrong doing which he had instigated. His failure to act was indefensible.

(b) On the same page as that letter was another dealing with the sexual activity of Reuben aged 6 and another child Jonas both having their little lovers among other little sisters who sometimes visited them. It referred to 3 year old Emanuel who "loves Mommy up", an activity described as "so sweet".

(c) In the "Blessings of Older Children", a couple wrote that their 9 year old son "was so in love with one sister and really went through trials when he knew a particular older brother was sleeping with her."

(d) In about 1981 a video was made for Berg and it showed a man Apples and his wife Sally and his young son J1. Sally referred to sharing with J1 and H1, Berg's grandson. Both boys were aged about 10.

(e) In April 1983 a television programme "TV Eye" was broadcast and Dennis Tuohy extracted allegations of a 3 year old girl having oral sex with her step father and a man having sexual relations with his 9 year old daughter. A Mr Geoff Whitcher, then a member of The Family, took part in that programme. I find it incredible to believe it was not reported back to World Service. Although this aspect was not investigated, there must be every likelihood that the matter of child sex was already a matter of public concern. The Family could not have been unaware of it. Whether they were or not, there is abundant evidence from The Family's own records to satisfy me that the leadership were aware of the problem well before the disclosure was made to the Teen Training Camp in Mexico in 1986. To assert that that was the first knowledge that came to the attention of the senior leadership and that the senior leadership "took immediate action to prevent any further abuse" is disingenuous.

f. In 1985 Berg was still fuelling these flames. In a chapter of "Heaven's Children", Grandpa went down to Earth. The story involved Berg making love to teenaged Tech. The drawing shows him in bed with Maria on one side and Tech on the other. There can be no artistic, literary or theological justification for such dangerously irresponsible material which could only tend to inflame and could never defuse improper passions. He returned to that refrain later in Heaven's Girl published in April 1987 and possibly published in chapter form earlier than that. This allegorical tale concerned Marie, pictorially a mixture of Tech and MB and among her many exploits, one is a fairly crude and explicit multiple rape of the girl by brutal soldiers. Another is a description of Marie "beginning to undulate and pulsate in beautiful sexual rhythm as she loves and makes love to her loving prophet, Dad". This book is standard reading for the children in the family but one has to doubt whether the English Literature class could ever have learnt anything - except perhaps to hone their skills in literary criticism

- from passages on Marie's "explosive and ecstatic moment of a powerful orgasm, her cries of ecstasy and moans of pleasure" or her "heavily panting gorgeous young body settling down in sheer ecstasy and utmost satisfaction having thoroughly enjoyed her thrilling love-making encounter with her beloved David". By any standards it is nauseating material to place before young children.

THE ORAL EVIDENCE OF CHILD / ADULT ABUSE.

The Family stand condemned by their own experts. Dr Melton agreed that there had been sexual abuse of children and teenagers by adults within The Family to a greater extent than outside it. Dr Millikan agreed. So do I. It is not necessary to burden this judgment with all the oral evidence that was led in this regard. This summary will have to suffice:

1. MB. Her first encounter was with her step-father in Paris when she was 7. He made her masturbate him. She was sent to Greece to join "Music with Meaning" and from then on it was constant sexual activity. She said:

"Paul (now the European CRO) immediately started sexual interaction with us doing everything except penetration. I began to realise I was expected to be "revolutionary", that is to say sexually to service the different men aged 25 to 30 plus." Among the men who abused her there was Jeremy Spencer. From the end of 1983 to August 1987 she was with Berg.

2. AB: She was in South America. At 7 a man in his 30's asked her to touch him; she was revolted because "it was so horrible." By 12 she had grown so used to it that she thought nothing if someone touched her bottom or her breasts or masturbated her. At 13 the Shepherdess asked if she would share with her husband, a man in his 40's and that was her first full sexual intercourse. It continued thereafter. It was suggested to her that this evidence was untrue because she had been examined by a doctor during the investigation into The Family's activities in Argentina. She denied that she had in fact been examined and she insisted that The Family knew it. At that stage JN430 was not in evidence. It was produced later. That records "The testimony of an arrested teen" and AB says:

"(The doctor) was supposed to check me for signs of sexual abuse, but since I looked so healthy and normal he decided just to take my word for it. He asked me if I had ever had sex and I answered no."

She said she lied to save The Family. She deceived to be true.

2. THE G BROTHERS. The younger brother JG who has left the group, gave evidence for the Plaintiff that at 6, the childcare worker in her 20's performed oral sex on him and that mutual masturbation then occurred on a number of occasions thereafter. His elder brother EG who remains in The Family and who gave evidence for the defendant confirmed that had happened. He explained that at the age of about 10 he would go to her room to look at her body and ask questions about it.

"I would take my clothes off and show her my penis. I would say if I play with it it feels nice. She would play with it. We were kissing and fondling each other." In his affidavit he described instances of oral sex and eventually full sexual intercourse. In his evidence, giving a clue to the sexual mores of that time in The Family, he said:

"She didn't think anything wrong with it, at the time there was nothing wrong or evil in it."

3. EG said in cross examination that his parents knew he was spending time in the child care worker's room and must have known sexual activities were taking place between them but they did nothing to stop it. It must not be forgotten that the boys' father was Apollon or Pathway, the editor of the Mo letters and

he author of "Heaven's Girl." Their mother is a European CRO. For them the Davidito Book would have been common practice.

4. RF. He is a respected member of the video ministry not far removed from the top leadership. He gave another account of sexual education by an adult of the young. He spoke in his affidavit of a childcare worker approaching him and RD-

"On the subject of sex education and told us the girls were curious to know about the male anatomy and if there was anything that we could do to help...I spent some time with and spoke to the two girls and talked to them about my body - no sexual activity occurred at all."

He made this affidavit in response to evidence RD had given. I have already observed that although I accepted the general purport of RD's evidence, much of which was confirmed by later events, the manner of his giving it was so emotive that I tended to look for corroboration of what he was saying. He is very hostile to The Family and a great publicist for their downfall. I do not, however, doubt his account of the events of November 1983 when they were in Dominica and the son and daughter of Peter Amsterdam and the daughter of the financial minister of the group visited with the child care couple in charge of them. This couple approached RD and RF and asked them to share with the girls who were only 10 and 11 years old. The little girl presented herself in a sarong with no panties. She masturbated him. He says that RF later told him that he (RF) had done likewise. In his oral testimony, RF went further than he did in his affidavit, admitting that at one point they asked to see his penis and he showed it to them. He denied his penis was erect. I regret that I did not believe him. He is a man consumed by terrible guilt over this incident and as RD says, he may have been "freaked out over it". He said he felt "peculiar" about it. He made the extraordinary admission of his having had a vision of his father coming into the room. It may well be, as Dr Cameron thinks, that this was his conscience. I am satisfied that as part of this extraordinary sex education lesson RF allowed if not encouraged these girls to masturbate him. In many other respects RF was a most engaging man. His enthusiasm for his work was catching. He forced me to watch one of the videos he made of the children singing and dancing and praising the Lord. I did not doubt his sincerity nor his belief that the way forward for The Family was to be more open and for the Teens to "be given more time and chance to express their desires of what they want out of life".

5. THE P'S: I have read Shuly's letter and her pointing to examples of lust and not love. It seems to be accepted now by those who knew the P family that their childcare worker, a man in his 20's, was an abuser. VP told me that at the age of 7 she was sitting on her bed when the baby sitter started masturbating her. He also abused DP. When, much later, this abuse was disclosed, the man concerned was removed from their home but later was admitted back because DP felt she was then old enough to escape his attentions. MP did in fact avoid his advances. She became sexually active of her own choosing at a young age. She very readily had a long and clandestine full sexual relationship with a shepherd of about 38 when she was back in Mexico aged 15. That was at a time when such contact had been prohibited.

6. DK filed an affidavit on the defendant's behalf. He did not give evidence. VP said that he told her that a woman had "jumped into bed with him". In his affidavit he testified of the time when aged 13 he had a sexual experience with a 20 year old woman. "I was a young teenage boy, she was a pretty 20 year old, I was shy but I felt like, "Wow, I scored".

7. KJ spoke of remembering very clearly of the first occasion, aged 3, in London, when her step father "touched me up, playing

with me, my vagina, I remember him licking me out, fingers inside me". She spoke of this through her tears. This sort abuse happened often. She felt "quite scared" by it. She knew it was sex but thought he was showing her love. He would grab her head and force fellatio on her. He tried to penetrate her when she was only 7 or 8 and it hurt. He was a crude man who would boast openly about his daughter being "a good fuck". That all of this abuse occurred seems to be accepted by The Family but they accepted no responsibility of it regarding step father as not one of their own. What is totally extraordinary about this sustained abuse is that KJ's mother was told about it. She said that at the time:

"I went into a state of shock but because of the indoctrination in the Mo letters I came to accept it. If Mo said it was OK, it must be OK. In "My Childhood Sex" he says his nanny was giving him oral sex and that it was acceptable so I accepted it. It is something I very much regret, I am ashamed by it, I am horrified to think I had such a belief in David Berg that I bowed to his teaching against my own conscience. I assumed him to be a man of God, a good man, it was incomprehensible he would be evil or use the Bible for evil, he talked with such authority. I am now deeply horrified and regret these things. He had no right to do these things to people who were vulnerable. I am very angry."

She is very angry. She now conducts a campaign against The Family to salve her conscience. I do not doubt that she paints the picture as black as she can but even stripping away layers of blackness, the picture still remains black.

KJ told me she "had sex" with 6 adults. It was clear from her descriptions, vibrant with detail that she used the words loosely to connote some form of sexual encounter usually of masturbation or simulated sexual intercourse. She complained that only Paul had full sexual intercourse with her, and that without her consent. She was on a road team from Pondacherry with two adults, Paul and Rose (not SF) and with 16 year old S3. She was 9 or 10. Paul knew she was sharing with S3. He wanted his share but KJ was unwilling. She was being selfish. So he raped her. Her screams woke Rose who did nothing to help. She was bleeding. She was very upset and withdrawn on return to the home. Eventually she explained what had happened to her in her Open Heart Report. That resulted in the shepherd giving her a reading assignment including "The Girl who Wouldn't" which conveyed the message that she, the victim, was in the wrong and that was out of spirit. In effect she, the child, was punished. He went scot free. There can be no greater indictment of Family practice than this. Here was an adult man whose sexual urges were not regarded depraved, but God given. Here was a child who did not have enough "love" to recognise his need or to sacrifice herself to meet it. Here was an evil corruption of the true notion of the noble ideal of love. KJ gave explicit detail of other encounters e.g. with Jeduthan, who was fat, old, bald and with glasses, with a fake laugh and "Jesus talk" such as "You're doing good work for the Lord, honey, Jesus loves you" but who would then "wank himself off through my legs and make me lick the sperm off his penis." And an the army officer-type Apollos (not Apollos of World Service) who her "shoved" against a banana tree until her back really hurt as he attempted to penetrate her. And Uria who was fat and bald like Jeduthan, who was sharing with her mother and who called her into his room. He made her sit naked on top of him, his penis between her legs. It was early morning and a man walked in to ask whether Uria wanted coffee or tea in bed. It was apparently unremarkable that KJ should be there. And Paulo who pulled the ribbon off her "sexy" nickers which came off during a gipsy evening so that she

was naked. He put his hand "on my crutch and put my hand on his hard-on. There was no intercourse but he ejaculated on her. He was 30 and had a strange accent. Or the man in Bangalore who had a moustache which was prickly. KJ was showering in the garden when she was frightened by a snake and as she ran away, she fell over in the mud. He took her into the bathroom to clean her, but got undressed and made her rub him all over. She said "it was quite fun - he was kissing my vagina and his moustache tickled and I was laughing."

8. MS. Her father is Jeremy Spencer of Music with Meaning. Her mother is Dawn, a European Shepherd. She is a true child of The Family. She is quite a pert little madam who learnt to strip at the age of 4 and the irony is that her current occupation is that of an "exotic dancer." In fact she would prefer to read law. Her evidence was heavily attacked by Mr Barton. It was suggested that the Plaintiff had bribed her with promises of holidays in Kenya to come and tell lies to me. I am satisfied that her evidence was not improperly procured and that she was broadly telling me the truth. She said in her affidavit:

"From my earliest memories until my time in India, sexual activity pervaded The Family. Instances that stand out in my mind are as follows:-

"My mother and my father frequently had sexual intercourse and performed oral sex with each other and with other people in the same room as us children, regardless of whether we were awake or asleep. I distinctly remember my father having sexual intercourse with Faithy Berg when we lived in a caravan in Greece. I was around four years old at the time." At the age of 6 she had to use both hands to masturbate Timothy in his 20's or 30's, ex-Vietnam veteran. At the same age she had to "help her father out" which meant caressing him and mutual masturbation. From the age of 7 her step father made her masturbate him. She later told Mary Malay about her step father but not about her father because she liked him: "at least," she said, "he did not beat me". She watched her brother aged about 12 having sexual intercourse with older women and her sister H2 having sexual intercourse with Solomon Touchstone whom she had seen on another occasion in the swimming pool having sexual intercourse with her mother. She saw her mother having sexual intercourse with a 16 year old called J1 whom she believed to be the same child J1 who was described as sharing with his English step-mother Sally in Australia as shown in Video number 5 produced by the Plaintiff. MS spoke of being in Italy when she was 11 when one of the men publicly put his hands in her shirt to feel her "barely budding breast." She always felt:

"A bit funny when old men used to come and touch me and I feel he is an ugly old man I don't want him touching me. I didn't complain because I didn't feel I'd get a good response because my mother thought it was ok, and would think I should think it was ok and that there was something wrong with me that I didn't like it."

She chose to have sexual intercourse with a 19 year old called C1 in the Finchley Road home 3 days before her 14th birthday. She was probably quite brazen about her having sexual intercourse at Rugby with DM, who was 16. She was by then well aware that it was against the rules.

THE FAMILY'S RESPONSE TO THIS ABUSE.

I am far from certain I have been given full frank information by The Family. In his first affidavit SPM says that "In 1985 a directive was sent out to all the homes world-wide reminding everybody that sex between adults and children was strictly forbidden and that this included sex between teenagers

and adults." He exhibited "Child Abuse?! An Official Statement from the Founders of the Children of God" which began with a quote from Moses David dated December 1988 :

"We do not approved with sex with minors, and hereby renounce any writings of anyone in our family which may seem to do so! We absolutely forbid it!"

The article stated:-

"In order to try to substantiate these absolutely false charges against us (of sex between adults and minors and adults and young children) some of our opponents have begun reproducing and distributing an article which was published within our group over 10 years ago. Although the article in question does make reference to an unusually loving relationship between the young woman who wrote it and the child she was caring for, even a quick glance makes it clear that the article is only the writer's account of her own personal experience and opinions. And it is by no means any kind of policy setting or instructional text. Such intimate relationships between minors and adults have never been officially encouraged or condoned within our fellowship and it was a very unfortunate oversight and mistake on our part 10 years ago to have allowed such an article to be published. Since then we have expressly forbidden and condemned any such conduct among our members."

That article was clearly "My Little Fish." I have already sufficiently demonstrated that this attempt to lay all the blame on Sara and none on the leadership is dishonest. The article continued:-

"In early 1985 "(my emphasis)" when it was called to our attention that some questions had arisen concerning sex between adults and minors, we issued an urgent directive to all of our communities world wide. In this missive, all of our members were strongly reminded that any such activities are strictly forbidden within our group. The following excerpts ARE TAKEN VERBATIM" (again my emphasis)" from this directive:-

"For the record we want to say that we do not agree with adults having sex with children! The Family should just not do it. And even though teen sex with adults may be tolerated in some countries, we are against it. Nudity and sex can be wonderful and beautiful and we have a good godly healthy attitude regarding it, but adults must refrain from practising it with minors! The best thing we can do is just not do it at all. Adults should refrain from any sexual involvement with under-aged minors!"

These are direct quotations from an internal memorandum which was issued to all of our communities OVER 3 YEARS AGO. "(I stress the fact that if issued 3 years earlier, then it was issued before 1985.)

The Official Solicitor called for sight of that internal memorandum. It has not been forthcoming. I have to wonder why not. My concern is also roused because a slightly different version of the same document was quoted by The Family in April 1992, in their document issued by World Services entitled "Our Replies to Allegations of Child Abuse". That again gave the date of the internal memorandum as being 1985. An explanation is given that:

"When rumours began to surface that some members were possibly having sexual contact with adolescents, action was taken to clearly explain to all members that not only was such conduct not condoned but strictly forbidden".

No particulars were given of the date or substance of those rumours. In this version of the memorandum, the reference was to adults having "sexual contact" with children which may be different from and so less serious than adults having "sex" with

children. It acknowledged teen sex with adults was not tolerated as its fruit is more bad than good." It contained this revealing passage:-

"Although Dad (Father David) has written about teens, and even younger children's sexual interests, these interests can be satisfied by a natural and open attitude with others of their own age. Also, it should be emphasised to our teens and children that they need do nothing against their will. They can always say, "No!" Young folks being affectionate with each other is natural and healthy, as long as they are not hurting each other; but let's keep it within the confines of their own age. Let's set the record straight here and now that youth with youth and teen with teen is the normal, natural type of loving affection that we and even society would expect."

The statement then acknowledged that:-

"Since 1985, even the above quoted degree of liberality described above regarding children and adolescents being sexually affectionate among themselves has been discouraged in our communities."

It is pertinent to note from that statement how inappropriately The Family shift the responsibility from the abusing adult and place it not just on the teens but also on the children, i.e. those below 13. They are the ones expected to have to say "No" to prevent advantage being taken of them against their will.

Yet another version is given in "The History of the Sexual Policies of The Family" dated November 1993, upon which SPM relies to answer the Official Solicitor's interrogatories. This document refers not to rumours circulating in 1985 but to a questionnaire given to the teens who attended the Mexican Teen Training Camp in 1986. Some of the questions enquired about their boy/girl relationships, and asked if they had any questions or wanted to make any comments regarding sexual matters. Of the approximately 110 teens in attendance, 10 of them wrote they had experienced some form of sexual contact with adults. Of these 10 3 girls aged 15 and 16 had experienced sexual intercourse. In all three cases their mothers had separated from the girls fathers had remarried and the sexual relationship occurred with their step-fathers. Those reports were forwarded by Gary and Faithy to Father David's household and Maria instructed Sara (who was responsible for Family childcare publications at the time) immediately to write an internal memorandum to the entire Family categorically forbidding all sexual contact of any sort between adults and minors. This memorandum, entitled "Liberty or Stumbling Block", clearly defined the policy regarding sex between adults and minors.

"Prior to this memorandum the need for a policy had not been appreciated as it was not realised that such a problem existed. However as soon as reports reached Father David and Maria that sexual relationship between adults and minors had occurred, a clear rule was imposed in which any such relationship were unequivocally forbidden. This rule has remained intact and has been enforced ever since".

I have to ask whether the internal memorandum of 1985 compiled after rumours had began to surface is the same as Sara's memorandum, "Liberty or Stumbling Block" written in 1986 as a response to the TTC questionnaire. Neither have been produced. Their importance is self-evident. I do not believe that they do not exist. I am driven to find that The Family have not been frank with me and I am bound therefore to be suspicious that the internal records of this highly organised computerised group contain information they wish to withhold from the court. These records were, after all, available in November 1993 two months before the trial began. It would have been important

to see whether it contained any acknowledgment of responsibility, though I doubt it, or any apology to those who had been victimised, which again I doubt, or any offer of help which is altogether too much to expect.

I have already referred to an undated document "Questions You Always Wanted to Ask" which referred to the fact that a question and answer session held "at recent TTC". I assume that to be the 1986 TTC. I see the document Teen Graduation which follows that article is dated September 1986. Apart from a question as to the ability of "older teens" getting "mated with an adult man", the answer to which is not very informative, there is nothing at all by way of general guidance to the other teens in The Family who did not have the benefit of going to Mexico. Why was this opportunity not taken to put them in the picture?

In May 1987 there was the publication "Good Thots". It contained someone's good thoughts on sex. Despite the apparent repudiation the year or two years previously, this reported:

"An idea that is becoming more popular among doctors etc. is that young children should be allowed and perhaps encouraged to conduct a full sex life without interference from parents. According to the argument children are sexual beings who need to develop skills early in life. Mary Calderone, head of the Influential Sex Information and Education of Council of the US says that "the child has a fundamental right to know....sexuality and to be sexual. Sexologists consider Freud's latency - a time of low sexual interest from about age 4 to puberty - to be misimposed by British society. They pointed out that the boy's sexual system beginning early - infant boys have erections and the vaginas in infant girls lubricate....Many researchers maintain that adult child sex is basically harmless to the child. Psychologist Douglas Powell of Harvard Health Service says "I have not seen anyone harmed by adult child sex so long as it occurs in a relationship with someone who really cares about the them."

This is an extraordinary bit of exculpation. Despite the literature purge, it remains current literature for The Family's consumption.

I have already referred to the "Child Abuse Official Statement" published in March 1989. That referred to:

"A written statement by the founding father of our group when he was recently asked what our official stance was regarding any of our past publications that purportedly condoned adults having sex of any kind with minors. "We do not approve of sex with minors, and we hereby renounce any writings of any one in our Family which may seek to do so."

I have not seen that written statement. It would appear from the quotation to have been issued in December 1988. Peter Amsterdam wrote to me to point out that the statement of renunciation was intended to include Berg's own writing among those which were capable of repudiation. It is a pity Berg himself did not make that clear. It is a greater pity he did not renounce the many statements, such as those identified in this judgment, of most of which he was the author, which, as I have demonstrated, cannot be construed otherwise than as conniving adults having sexual contact with minor's. The only document referred to in the "Child Abuse Official Statement" is Sara's "My Little Fish" published by "very unfortunate oversight". I reject that statement.

In June 1989 Maria wrote "Child Abuse: A Final Warning". In it she said:-

"Parents - or any other adults for that matter - certainly do not have sex with children! Or under aged teens! For

example, no matter how much a man may feel drawn to a sexy teen girl, and love her and want to get intimately involved with her, it's simply not wise. They don't have to, and they had better refrain from it. To have any kind of affair or sexual relationship with a minor is just about the most dangerous thing any of our adults could do. And it's not even necessary! There's no need or legitimate reason for it! In fact nothing is necessary if it's going to hurt the Lord's work! And anybody who does it is in serious trouble, not only with the world but with us!...So if we hear of any who violate these rules, we're going to immediately excommunicate them...It's been researched and proven by experts that in almost every case where an adult got involved with a teen, the relationship fails simply because there are too many differences of interests, teens who have had such involvement with adults have almost unanimously manifested a very negative, regretful or remorseful reaction to such experiences. So I definitely think it's far better that our adults completely avoid such involvements with minors!"

That is a determined attempt to stamp out the practice which I highlight because it deserves as much even double the emphasis as I have given to the objectionable passages. It has to be applauded. It contains some acknowledgment of the harm these sexual contacts cause the teenagers. The letter might have taken the opportunity to stress just how much such actions hurt not only the Lord's work but the children. It might have made more plain that such actions were not only "simply not wise" but also categorically wrong. The letter is addressed to disciples and friends. It is a shame no letter was written to the teenagers offering them help, advice and apology.

In October 1989 Maria published "Flirty Little Teens Beware". This was to be read "unitedly" by adults and teens. It referred to:

"Some teen girls play on sexual angles to try to get the men's attention. That's all a lot of them want, attention, but it can easily be misinterpreted by the men as meaning something else. So you may need to take a definite stand in your own hearts and minds that you're not going to be swayed by anything that some young teen girl may do to interest or even entice you. And likewise you adult women had better not get involved with under age boys! There is nothing wrong with fighting against giving in to sexual desires if in some particular situation they are wrong. Let's face it, sex is not something that's always good, clear across the board. Just because we promote sex and believe God made it and that it's his wonderful creation doesn't mean that it's always good under every circumstance."

That is good sound advice. She continued:-

"In most cases our teen girls have been fairly innocent. They have probably seen their mothers and aunts and uncles and everyone show lots of love and affection to others, so they've just figured, "Well this is what we're supposed to do!"

This was a tacit admission that the heavily sexualized ethos of Family life as I have set out in this judgment, contributed to the corruption of innocent children. Maria gave the girls a warning:-

"So when you're trying to get him involved and you're trying to make eyes at him and tease him and play up to him and rub up against him and kiss him and everything else whatever your motivation may be, he is the one who is going to really suffer for it. ... I think in some cases the teen girls provoke it even more than the men! (Fam: Our teen girls definitely need to hear this message because some of them really do initiate it. The little pre-teen girls usually don't know what they are provoking, they're more uninformed and inexperienced. But most of the teens are very much aware of what they are doing, although they don't really fully understand the consequences.) Yes, after

hearing all about our former FFing and everything, they probably want to try the same thing. Well our people are already FFed and they are in The Family, so our young girls certainly don't need to try and FF them, it's very dangerous for them to do so". Again this appears to me to be a tacit acknowledgment that Family practices have contributed to the harm suffered.

There was a further grudging acknowledgment in this passage:-

"This is the very thing the system would like to use against us - sex with minors which they always term child abuse although in our loving Family there would be very little possibility of genuine abuse, and IF there has been any, **HOPEFULLY WE'VE NOW GOTTEN RID OF THE PROBLEM COMPLETELY.** Most of our teens are no naive they don't even understand why someone would deserve to be excommunicated for a thing like this." (My emphasis.) I observe that in the "Loving Family" it would not be "genuine abuse." This a worrying disingenuous statement based upon the totally flawed belief that if done in love in accordance with the Law of Love, sex with minors (child abuse) is not capable of being abusive.

In June 1990 The Family published "Don't be Ignorant of the Devil's Devices". This letter was written to help The Family the better to "inform your children" about the false child abuse accusations that were currently being stirred up against The Family in many countries. It contained a "special notice to Family teens" written by W.S staff at Maria's request. This is an important document. I quote from it:-

"Mama recently expressed concern for you teens that when you read how strongly we are condemning any sort of intimate relationships between adults and minors, some of you may have some questions. Some of you could even possibly wonder, "Oh my! I remember a few years ago when Uncle so-and-so and I cuddled and had fun together, was that sex abuse?" This again seems to me to be an acknowledgment that a few years previously Uncles did cuddle and have fun - which is an undisguised euphemism for sexual contact - with young girls. There is a further tacit acknowledgment in the following passage:-

"But we are sure you are probably aware of the fact that there can be a very strong natural attraction between men and blossoming teen girls and **IN THE PAST**, before our hypocritical enemies started slinging all their child abuse accusations at us, **WE ENJOYED CERTAIN GOD GIVEN LIBERTIES AND THAT NATURAL ATTRACTION OCCASIONALLY DID LEAD TO SOME INVOLVEMENT AND AFFECTION SHOWN BETWEEN SOME OF OUR ADULT MEN AND TEEN GIRLS AND THE SAME THING OCCASIONALLY TOOK PLACE BETWEEN SOME TEEN BOYS AND ADULT WOMEN.**" (My emphasis.)

World Services are not referring here to the ten children who made confession at the 1986 Mexico TTC. World Services knew full well that the problem was much more widespread than that. The notice continued:-

"So if you happen to be a teen who happened to have any kind of involvement or experience along these lines, we wanted to encourage you that you do not need to feel condemned, guilty, ashamed or confused. When you read in the letters how any and all such activities are now strictly forbidden and that anyone who engages in them will be excommunicated, you don't need to go to extremes and start getting worried about your health and your past. You'd be much better off if you just trust the Lord and believe that your past is all in His hands and leave it there!"

The psychiatric evidence I have heard expresses the view, with which I agree, that rather than suppress these horrors, they should be brought out into the open, fully and frankly acknowledged, and then dealt with, with skilled therapeutic help if necessary. Prayer may well be a help but Maria's advice to bury the past and pretend it did not happen is wrong and unacceptable.

The virtue of the Law of Love is then extolled because whatever is done in love is acceptable in the eyes of God. Expediency and the System "making such a big stink and getting so freaked out and infuriated about anything they even suspect may be child sex abuse", forced the complete forbidding of any and all such relationships. Then followed another tacit admission and another exculpation:-

"That's not to say that any intimacies or loving relationships that may have taken place in the past were necessarily all wrong, wicked, sinful or of the devil! That is simply not the case."

There followed this important passage:-

"But you don't know my story," some teens may say. "It wasn't very intimate or loving - I feel like I was "abused" or at least "used" by so-an-so!" Well, if you were actually mistreated or hurt in any way, we're certainly very sorry about that(my emphasis) - "and we're sure that whoever was involved with you is sorry as well. Let's not forget, we all make mistakes and we know that there have been adults and teens who simply didn't realise how much they were "playing with fire" when they may have gotten involved in a playful experimental or crush type of relationship in the past. And sometimes before they knew it, things got more serious or went further than either of them had originally anticipated. If this was the case with you, you need to realise that you don't have to look back on that experience as a horrible mistake of some kind or that the person you were with was some sort of dirty old man or monster! All of us have learnt a lot of lessons over the past few years, and we've realised that adult teen relationships should not only be avoided because they cause trouble with the system, but they are also very difficult for either party to handle emotionally, it's easy for people to have their feelings hurt, and the people involved often become distracted in their work for the Lord etc etc., which are all reasons why we have expressly forbidden any such relationships. We live and we learn!"

That passage is important because it contains what seems to me to be the first apology to the hurt children. It is a step in the right direction. But acknowledgment of responsibility is still woefully lacking. The mistakes that seem to be acknowledged to have been made were the mistakes of those who played with fire. There was no acknowledgment of any mistake made by Berg or in any of the literature, still less was there any admission of responsibility. On the contrary, the notice informed the teens that:-

"You can be very thankful for the honest, open and loving attitude towards sex that Grandpa had taught us in the letters."

At least WS acknowledge learning a lesson in realising that adult/teen relationships have to be avoided not only because of trouble with the system but because of their own inherent, harmful consequences. It is an admission of some of the truth, but not the whole of the truth.

In November 1991 the Good News published "Questions and Answers on Sex, Freedoms and Relationships." When The Family asked why things were so much more restricted than they were when The Family used to be a lot freer sexually, the answer was because many within The Family mised

the freedom -

"A lot of us found ourselves caught in a maelstrom of romantic and sexual feelings, emotions and relationships that were very overpowering and could virtually control us because we let them occupy so much of our minds and hearts and time. This of course resulted in quite a few serious problems causing our work and fruitfulness for the Lord to suffer greatly."

The Family then had the honesty to ask the next question.

"If it resulted in all kinds of problems, then all of that sexual freedom must have been wrong."

Answer:-

"There was - and is - absolutely nothing wrong with the freedoms that the Lord gave us. The Lord showed Grandpa that the scripture, "All things are lawful unto us", literally means exactly what it says; that there are no exceptions, all things indeed are lawful for believers in Jesus who are motivated by love...the problems resulted because a lot of us abused these freedoms and began looking on them as a means to gratify our own fleshly lusts instead of using them to sacrificially and lovingly help others."

The Family continued the cross examination, no doubt with the same sense of futility as may have been experienced by the grandmother and Official Solicitor. The next question, and it is a very good question, was:-

"If Grandpa knew that The Family would probably have as much trouble handling such freedoms as the early church did, then why did he ever promote it?"

Answer:

The Lord used it to test us and teach us many lessons that we would never have learned otherwise".

I see no hint of any acknowledgment on the part of the leadership that they, or their leader Berg, were even partly responsible for some at least of the harm which they knew was bound to have arisen. Nor is there in that document a sniff of contrition or sympathy.

In 1992, partly as a result of proceedings in Australia and in this Court, The Family published their "Beliefs and Teaching regarding Sex" and their "Replies to Allegations of Child Abuse. This was a guarded document with guarded concessions, for example:

"So although a number of articles that were written several years ago could be construed as seeming to condone some rather questionable practices concerning under age minors and sex, such things never in any way became an official policy....nor did the majority of our membership of that time ever have sexual involvement with a minor whatsoever."

One notes the concession made in respect of "a number of articles", which is an advance on just "My Little Fish". The authors must have had in mind Berg's other writings than those referring to putting a young male child to sleep by fondling his penis, because they referred to his also having "broached the subject of whether each and every sexual contact between an adult and minor was in fact necessarily harmful". He did more than broach the subject. He promoted it. They "regret that some speculative views were published in which the massaging or fondling of a young child by the mother or nanny was discussed as a means of relaxing or putting the child to sleep." In their conclusion they acknowledged:

"that some mistakes were made in the past but we also believe we have done our best to correct them and to put stringent measures in place to prevent them from happening again".

Importantly, World Services were able to say:

"To anyone who may have been abused in any way in

he past by a member of one of our communities, we sincerely apologise. It was never our intent that anyone especially children should ever be hurt, and we hope that you are assured by the above mentioned safeguards now in place, that today no abuse of children is tolerated in our fellowship."

Such glimmers of hope as I might derive from that public statement is badly dented by the three letters written in December 1992 in response to a message Berg received from a church leader who was advising The Family to modify their stance regarding sexual freedoms in order to become more acceptable to the system. The letters are "Why Do Ye Stone Us?", "We can't Recant the Truth", and "There's No Way Out but Up," collected in GN 554 and published in July 1993. The general tone of these letters is a strident re-affirmation of policy, a stark challenge to the system and a depressing call to the membership to:

"help us fight. God will support you! You want to be a winner and die for Jesus? Join us. It's gonna be thrilling!"

It makes the most depressing reading especially if I am to take the following as the true position of the leadership today:-

"So what else can we expect from the law, man's laws, but to be contrary to the laws of God! What else can we expect but persecution, incarceration and some day even death. So there's no reconciliation, it's impossible! Some of our friends have even suggested that we modify our scriptural belief in the freedom granted to us under the Law of Love, to come out and deny it or change it or admit that it was wrong. But how are we going to do that?"

The letter concluded with a chilling passage:-

"What else can we do?....All we can do is stand up, and go up! There's no way out but up! Death is our only hope..." The words are chilling because the Jonestown suicides, the Waco Siege and the even more recent cult killings in Switzerland and Canada and the poison gas attacks in Japan are all vivid reminders of the terrifying power certain religious leaders have to lead their members to death. I wish, however, to record the clear finding, from which I will not shrink, that there was no evidence that this mother or anyone close to her at the Ward's home are likely to join in any mass suicide, even if, which I also find unlikely, World Services called on The Family to die. I dismiss those fears.

The Family held a summit meeting sometime towards the end of 1992 though I think in the literature it is called the "Summit 1993" meeting. It was led by Peter Amsterdam and Gary and attended by the CRO teamworks. I have been provided with Part I of the summary of Summit '93 (GN539) which refers to the intention to address the Law of Love in a summary of "Summit '93 Part II." I have not seen that document. This letter "Our Beliefs Concerning the Lord's Law of Love" GN558 (July 93) may be the document referred to. It was realised by The Family that the adults and young people needed clarification about the leadership's stance concerning the Law of Love and the leadership needed also to come to a decision concerning "how to explain to the public or a Court of law our beliefs in the Law of Love and the experience some have had in the past as a result." I assume that the presentation to the Court is contained in the History compiled in November 1993, some 110 pages of which are set out in answer to the Official Solicitor's Interrogatories. As mentioned, I also have GN555 "Our beliefs concerning the Lords law of Love", published in July 1993 for The Family's consumption. It is therefore, an important document. The letter sets out an analysis of the principles of the Law of Love and concludes "it was good and overall it bore good fruit." The letter does, however, make some acknowledgment that because some

were not as mature and loving and yielding to the Lord as they should have been, there were some problems and some mistakes. They acknowledged:-

"We realise that there were some instances in which some individuals did not always strictly follow the principles and guidelines of the Law of Love and in some cases some of these liberties unfortunately were used as an occasion of the flesh. If any of you were personally guilty of any unloving acts, we trust you have sincerely asked the Lord to forgive you....If you haven't already, we're sure you'd also want to ask anyone you have offended to forgive you, providing they are in your home or nearly in your area and you are able to verbally apologize to them. We do not recommend that you write to others about things of this nature. We are truly sorry if any of our members were hurt or offended in any way by someone who misapplied or in some way strayed from the strict guidelines of the Law of Love".

This is again an acknowledgment of the existence of the child abuse problem and I am quite certain that The Family know more about it than they have been prepared to reveal. That was why nothing should be put in writing.

Maria commented:

"I'd just hate to have our Family members acting as though Dad was wrong when we know that is not the case. If there was anything wrong it was that some Family members may have gotten into some excesses and taken things to the extreme in some cases, using such liberties as an occasion for the flesh". For Maria the problem was that:-

"If we sit back and let Dad take all the "blame" for all our controversial Biblical doctrines that the system doesn't like and criticise like our sexual openness and our sexual freedom among ourselves...and many other radical doctrines that have made us what we are, then aren't we in a sense both denying Dad and the Word itself".

The tenor of the letter is not to compromise, and not to blame Berg, not to blame the Law of Love for the acknowledged excesses of the flesh. I find that attitude extremely worrying. It is neither an acceptable nor a responsible position to take.

CONCLUSIONS

1. I am totally satisfied that there was widespread sexual abuse of young children and teenagers by adult members of The Family, and that this abuse occurred to a significantly greater extent within The Family than occurred in society outside it.

2. Berg was well aware when he propounded his Law of Love that there was a high risk that many who followed it were not mature enough wisely and responsibly to use the freedom (that "dangerous toy") conferred on them in a way which did not cause harm. Harm to children was readily foreseeable as soon as he had schooled The Family to accept that even young children were sexual beings. By endowing children with the same sexual responses as were enjoyed by adults, he made them objects of sex. He placed them within the scope of the Law of Love. That law depends upon full free and informed consent being given to the contemplated activity. Children's consent to sexual activity can never be the product of a free will both because they do not have the maturity to understand the emotional consequences of any sexual engagement, but also because, due to the imbalance of power between adult and child, any decision of the child is made under influence and pressure. Apparent consent is thereby vitiated. The overwhelming body of psychiatric opinion across the world is dismissive of the apologia propounded in Good Thots and is firmly of the view that exposure to early sexuality is harmful to children. There is even enough acknowledgment in

the documents that The Family now recognise that the teenagers involved in sexual relationships with adults suffered emotional upheaval which interfered with the Lord's work. It is not a difficult step also to acknowledge that in fact these children have suffered emotional harm.

3. It is, therefore, quite unacceptable for The Family to cast the blame upon the immature or weak members and not to face up to what is a harsh truth unpalatable to them that Berg bears responsibility for propagating the doctrine which so grievously misled his flock and injured the children within it.

4. This is a condign judgment on Berg, on those in authority who failed to curb these wild excesses and on The Family as a whole. It was a deplorable period of their history. They have been rightly vilified by the media and pilloried by the press for it. It was, however, a period of their history. I am now totally satisfied that The Family, I would think largely at Maria's prompting, has since 1986 made determined and sustained efforts to stamp out child sexual abuse and to prevent any inappropriate contact between adults and children whether young children or teenage children. I have no evidence that child sex abuse is presently prevalent any more within The Family than outside it.

INCEST

THE LITERATURE

In "The Devil Hates Sex" May 1980 Maria asks, "Well, what about incest? That's a big big question in The Family right now." Little evidence has been disclosed to me of The Family's concerns about incest and I do not know why it had become such a big question. There was a letter from Seek and Secundus published in Family News in about 1981 where they asked how much flesh brothers and sisters can share when they are older. That could only be an example, one presumably of many, of the questions then being raised with W. S. by the ordinary members. I can also only assume that if there was a debate, it was a debate which had a foundation of fact to justify the differences of practice under discussion.

Berg's response was that the subject of incest was so dangerous that he hardly even dared talk about it in the privacy of their bedroom because "the system practically goes berserk when you talk about incest". Maria replied:

"We'll just have to tell the kids that it's not prohibited by God but you'd better watch out because its dangerous". In Berg's view:-

"There is nothing in the world at all wrong with sex as long as it's practised in love, whatever it is, or whoever it's with, no matter who or what age or WHAT RELATIVE" "or what manner and you don't even dare say these words in private. If the law ever got a hold of this, they would try to string me up, they'd probably lynch me before I got to jail...There are NO RELATIONSHIP RESTRICTIONS or age limitations in his law of love. But system law has made it all against the law, and if I'd tell you what I think I'd probably break the law publishing it." (My emphasis.)

As I read those passages there is nothing which makes incest inconsistent with the Law of Love. Maria irresponsibly proffered the advice:-

"At least not let'em find out if you do it".

In November 1982 Berg wrote "Sex with Grandma". He described how at the age of 19 or 20 he had perforce to share a bed with his middle-aged mother. It was cold and in the middle of the night she snuggled up to him "real right". He wrote:-

"And perhaps if I had not been so conservative and extremely narrow -minded in my theology and religion at that

time and so absolutely frightened by my mother's seeming abandon at the moment, I might have reacted a little more responsively and perhaps have satisfied both of us and our mutual tremendous sexual needs, and it could have developed into a beautiful sexual relationship".

He then recounted a dream he had of falling into the garden of love and there making love to his mother. He described waking up and making love to Maria who became his mother at the moment of orgasm. It was an extraordinary document to publish and it was mischievous to do so.

In "Heaven's Children" there was another extraordinary passage of Tech, Maria's daughter, dreaming of "her Grandpa lover". He wrote:-

"Of course as there are no longer any such things as man's legalistic laws against incest in this loving kingdom of God, everyone loves everyone and is completely free in his/her encompassing love. So I make wonderful sweet precious love to my now beautiful teenage Tech...afterwards they (Tech and Maria) both awake excitedly...to discover that both of them...dreamt they had made love with me right here in the bed together."

This passage is one which is used as an example of attacking The Family and in the document "Contending for the Faith" The Family's response is given to it. I regret that once again I see no justification for the publication of this story and again I am driven to conclude that it was irresponsible to permit it to appear at all and reprehensible to include it in material which it was known would be placed before children.

THE ORAL EVIDENCE

MB gave evidence of her relationship with her grandfather. Her evidence is plainly of importance. She is a disaffected former member. Her aunt Deborah (Berg's daughter), has led a campaign whose object is that The Family be destroyed. MB has been subjected to the influence of Deborah. She is in close contact with all those intent on The Family's downfall. Her evidence, more than anyone's, had to be subjected to the most careful scrutiny. She is moreover a young woman with an uncertain psychiatric history. I shall set out in detail how her health broke when she was in The Family, when, beyond question, she suffered psychotic episodes. She had treatment in the United States after her repatriation there. I have no medical reports giving me any accurate picture of her mental condition. I had no help in judging whether or not her undoubted breakdown had impaired her ability to remember the events taking place before and even during these psychotic episodes. I asked Dr Cameron for his opinion. He told me that in the light of MB's pre-morbid personality which all described as conscientious, dutiful and good, she can be relied on to give an accurate account of what had happened. I shall treat that opinion cautiously. It does not justify my immediate acceptance of what she said but there is no evidence that her illness makes her unreliable. It remains for me to judge whether her hostility undermines her credibility. I became more and more convinced by her evidence the longer she gave it. She did not seem to me to paint the picture blacker than it was. She said at one point that she only wished to say what was necessary and there were several instances where it would have been perfectly possible for her to gild the lily had that been her purpose. By way of one example, she spoke of her time in the Philippines and of Simon Peter's involvement with the young. She said that she and her friend A1 had been taking a nap and when she awoke, A1 told her that Simon Peter had had sex with her. She said she did not see it and when offered the opportunity to say that he had miscondacted

himself with her, she unhesitatingly said that he had not. I had to consider the extent to which she was prone to exaggeration. I had listened aghast to her account of her exorcism and I began to think it could not possibly all be true. Much later in the case I read The Family's own account, which appeared to be a transcript of a tape recording of the events as they happened and that showed that MB had been moderate in her complaint of the indignities heaped upon her. It was suggested to her that because she had been billed for stardom within The Family as the leader's granddaughter and had so enjoyed the spotlight of adulation during her time with Music with Meaning, she now could not survive without being the centre of attention and so in order to appear on television "Chat Shows", she needed to say more and more outrageous and untrue things. I totally reject that criticism of her. That is not at all how she struck me. Because I believe her, I find that Berg and Maria came down to her bedroom and whilst Maria and Sarah were talking, Berg got into her bed in their presence and fondled her. This happened on a number of occasions. She was called to his quarters. He was invariably impotent and they did not have sexual intercourse though he once tried to penetrate her, so there is no evidence of incest strictly defined. He did rupture her hymen with his finger. They had oral sex. That was oral sex by him on her, not so far as she could recollect by her on him. At one point they went through a mock celebration of marriage. Maria was fully aware of what was happening.

There is some very slight corroboration for what she says. In the letter "The Last State" Berg berated her in these terms:-

"What have you against me? What have I ever done to you but shower attention on you, even favour you, even tried to be good to you, help you, let you live in our home for 3 years, support you, lavish every kind of good and love on you that we possibly could, invited you into our own quarters right here to live right next door to us and to sleep with my children and into our own bedroom and into our own bed."

There were other strange pieces of evidence, though I do not need them to complete the jigsaw. In "The Dangers of Demonism" the complaint is that MB:

"considered herself to actually be Heaven's Girl, thinking herself to be so perfect, wonderful and spiritual, and would go out and criticise Dad and Mama thinking she, MB, would be the new teen Maria."

It was also written:

"She began to believe that Grandpa loved her more than anyone else, even more than Mama. She confessed to thinking she should take Mama's place because she considered herself to be Heaven's Girl."

Although it is far fetched, I bear in mind the curious tale of the Heaven's Girl's sexual encounter with Grandpa.

One of the matters about which The Family are particularly sensitive, so sensitive in fact that in the document "Contending for the Faith" they school the members in how to deal with this matter, is the question of Berg's sexual relationship with his own daughter. It seems to me that Berg stands condemned of this by Faithy's published reaction to "Childhood Sex" and her reference to "front rubbin" which made her feel good all over and which she did not think perverted her at all. It is a clear admission of masturbation by father on daughter.

I am not alone in concluding that sexual abuse took place in David Berg's household. The Family's own expert Dr Millikan is of the same opinion.

THE LEADERS' INVOLVEMENT IN SEXUAL ABUSE.

The evidence is sparse and the conclusions are incomplete and imperfect. The most - or I suspect more accurately, the least - I can confidently find is this:-

1. DAVID BERG

I am completely satisfied that he was obsessed with sex and that he became a perverted man who recklessly corrupted his flock and did many of them serious damage which he made no attempt to redress and for which he never admitted any personal responsibility. Hypocritically he did not practice what he preached, that confession and repentance are good for the soul. Now he is dead. May the Lord have mercy on his soul. There will be many who will not mourn his passing. KJ is no doubt among that large number. He did not live long enough to read her indictment of him as she gave evidence. Those of us who heard it, those of us whose hearts are not frozen by prejudice, whose ears are not deaf to things they do not wish to hear and whose eyes are not blind to genuine tears, we will remember that young woman breaking down in the witness box and through her sobs crying out:-

"If it's changed so much, how can it have changed? This all started with David Berg. He's the one who decided it all. It's all his prophecy, so how can he suddenly change it all. Is he saying it's all wrong, saying that he made a mistake? Where's all this counselling being given to the victims he's made? Has he done anything to help to stop the suffering that has happened and is just going to keep going on because you suffer it all your life. How can it have changed? It's changed on the outside so that we don't persecute them. It hasn't changed his heart. It hasn't changed his mind. It's just made things more covered up, more secretive, that's all. He hasn't said sorry for any of the things he started in the first place. He hasn't done anything to correct them to make them right. How can you say it's changed? People are still suffering for what he's done to us. It'll be with me for the rest of my life, I know that. Every decision I make, everything I do. I still have phobias, phobias about men. Where's all the help. If you do wrong to someone or thousands of people, you should help if you really believe in your heart that you've done wrong and I don't believe he does."

I make no apology for repeating and adopting this passionate declamation.

2. MARIA

She has been at Berg's side throughout all of this. She did not initiate it but for a long time participated in the excesses and saw her own son abused and harmed. I believe that she in her heart of hearts knows just how wrong the propagation of these freedoms were. MB fairly observed that Maria was not likely to have been able to have stopped the sexual relationship Berg was promoting between MB and Davidito and MB also said she felt that Maria was not happy with what Grandpa was doing to her. I am also satisfied that Maria does lead the determined effort that has been made to stop these practices. I believe that her expressions of regret are genuine, though belated and insufficient.

3. SARA DAVIDITO

She stands condemned by her upbringing of Davidito and Techi and her own daughter Davida and she was a party to the abuses which took place within the Berg household. She remains notwithstanding all of that, a highly respected and influential childcare officer. I have no confidence in her.

4. PETER AMSTERDAM

I find he was corrupted by the sexual freedoms his revered leader offered him. MB spoke of Amsterdam being in bed with Maria while she was in bed with Grandpa. I had no reason to doubt it. Sated with sex, the ordinary inhibitions and

the social taboos broke down, as Dr Cameron explained they would, and there is evidence that Amsterdam "shared" with MB and A1.

5. GARY

MB did not complain about him and I have therefore no evidence as to his involvement.

6. CJ - (SIMON PETER)

There is hearsay evidence from MB that A1 said she had had sex with him. It is insufficient for me to find that against him.

7. MICHAEL GILLIGAN - APOLLOS

I cannot recall evidence against him.

8. JEREMY SPENCER

His own daughter with understandable reluctance complained that he abused her as I find he did. He also abused MB. Music with Meaning was a particularly corrupt and corrupting organisation. He played a central part in it.

9. PAUL PELLOQUIN - JOSIAH

He Was another member of the Music with Meaning team. He corrupted and abused the young girls who were part of the singing and dancing troupe. What troubles me gravely is that he is now the European Shepherd and S is subject to his controlling influences - or the lack of them.

10. EM

She is another childcare expert who was prepared to encourage the teenagers in her charge in Japan to have sexual intercourse, some of them for the first time. It was she who belatedly woke up to the fact that she was promoting promiscuity. She did not appear to grasp the irony of contrast between that behaviour and her proudly proclaiming that she had brought up her own daughter to be a chaste young woman.

There is, therefore, overwhelming evidence that the high leadership within The Family has been guilty of child sexual abuse. That must concern this Court.

It would be wrong, however, not to record, with equal emphasis, that there is no evidence whatever that there is anyone in authority at the Ward's home or nationally has himself or herself been guilty of sexual abuse. I find that they were not party to any of those excesses. They had read My Little Fish but could not believe that such sexual contact was appropriate. In the MAs case, they robustly rejected the invitation for their child to share with another. There never has been even a suggestion that NT herself has committed any indecency. The acquittal of this young mother and those close to her occupies this lonely paragraph in a very long judgment, but the acquittal will remain prominent in my mind when I come to balance the risks of harm to S.

With a sigh of relief, I turn from sex abuse to the other no less important and perhaps more important issues in the case.

MEDICAL NEGLECT

The Plaintiff's case was that The Family so strongly believe in the healing power of prayer, that they are neglectful of the need for proper medical treatment; that because they too frequently believe that illness is a punishment for sinfulness, they are intolerant of those who suffer physical or mental disability.

The Family do not deny their belief in healing by faith. They assert it. They are fully justified in doing so. It is an established tenet of Christian belief. I am much less certain of the theological justification for the apparent correlation between illness and sin, nor do I intend to enter into that debate. For the purpose of this judgment it is sufficient for me to express my concern about the effect on children of such passages as I find in

"True Comix" clearly designed to be read by young children which told them:-

"But sometimes if we're really being bad or foolish and doing things we know are wrong, the Lord may take away His protection and let us get hurt or sick as punishment for being so naughty. Sometimes that's why we get sick, because the Lord is spanking us for being naughty. When we're sick we should pray and ask the Lord why. If we have been bad or naughty, if we are really sorry, he forgives us and heals us.... Sometimes maybe you'll be sick even when you weren't bad and did nothing wrong. Maybe God let you get sick to show you he can heal you like he did with the blind man in the Bible."

The drawings showed a young girl in bed with measles or chicken pox apparently thinking she had been naughty because the picture showed that God had her over his knee, her trousers but not her panties down and He was spanking her on the bottom. The Family seemed oblivious of the dangers in such messages. The danger was that the messages were taken literally and to extremes. In an organisation where strong faith and unquestioning obedience were drummed into all, young and old, extreme reactions were inevitably likely to follow. This is seen in the sad story of Shuly.

This girl was a deeply committed member of the group. Some of her letters to the leadership have been published and are before me, others are not. She contracted Lupus, a debilitating disease. She wrote to Berg asking for permission to read "System" books against which Berg had so vehemently railed in such letters as "You are What you Read." I am told by the girl's mother SP, that the letter was published with the footnote from Berg hoping Shuly would be healed but suggesting that perhaps Lupus provided the answer for her. What did that mean? SPM provided this explanation in his Affidavit:-

"Having diagnosed the problem, I have no doubt that the disciple would be encouraged to pray for healing and to try to discover through prayer the cause of what it is, what the meaning is. Sometimes illness can lead people to greater faith and to examine their heart to see what, if any, message there is in their situation. We believe that illness can have a spiritual dimension to it."

In the result this seriously ill child was led to the belief that God was spanking her and inflicting a terminal disease upon her as a punishment for her reading the sort of books which, if her rights as an intelligent young person enjoyed any respect at all, would have been freely and unquestioningly available to her. As she faced death, she lived with the terror that her faith was so weak that she had lost God's protection, was unworthy of healing and rightly condemned to eternal damnation. This was emotional abuse to an intolerable degree. Her mother on one occasion found her in a state of shock because she had been reading a Mo letter not placed before me, "When the Incurable become Unbearable" which suggested that those with incurable disease should be placed in homes so that the missionaries could go on unimpeded by such a handicap. Of the same tenor was the "Rotten Apples":-

"We must remember that if there is a retarded or deformed, chronically sick or handicapped child, a queer child or baby born in a family, there is usually something wrong with the mother or father that God is chastening them for and either trying to teach them a lesson or simply punish them for their past or present sins. It's certainly not the child's fault. ... We cannot allow one handicapped soldier to drag down the whole army, nor one rotten apple to spoil the whole barrel full. The problem has either to be cured or The Family delivered from it. ... (The mother) should confess and repent of her sins which caused it,

acknowledge it and ask for deliverance, and then the whole family should pray desperately for the deliverance of the child so that at least its spirit changes from a bad spirit to a good one; or I would suggest that perhaps both should be separated from The Family and certainly from a family with other children in which the retarded child could be a bad influence or even a danger. ... Let's lay aside every weight and these fruits of sin that do so easily beset us and let us run the race and not sit down spending our full time taking care of a bunch of handicapped who will never be able to truly serve the Lord as well as we! Don't let the devil deceive and side track you into something less than the best."

I well understand that that is not the whole story. Not all cases received that extreme treatment. In 1991, which is 10 years after Rotten Apples, letters were published by a mother, Marianne, concerning her Downes Syndrome baby whose two years of life in her mother's care touched and inspired many.

Other contradictions abound. When Flirty Fishing was most enthusiastically pursued, it had as its consequence, inevitably, that many of the women contracted venereal disease. It was almost enough to persuade Berg to cry a halt to that profitable enterprise. He did not. Instead he wrote the scurrilous paper suggesting that Christ might have contracted a venereal disease from Mary Magdalene, who had been a known prostitute, and that just as He suffered for our sins, so the FFing girls were similarly afflicted because of the sins of the men they were trying to save. Venereal disease was, accordingly, a part of the continuing sacrifice they had to make. Maria "had something three times just in the space of about three months". Their resolution was:-

"We pray immediately of course, but we also go to the doctor to get him to do whatever he can to help clear it up."

There was, therefore, no embargo on seeking medical help but there was often some reluctance to do seek it to the detriment of the patient. There were examples of that in the evidence before me. JG in Roumania in about 1992, had a boil on his face which became so badly infected that he became seriously ill. His requests for a doctor to attend or for his being taken to hospital were refused. Prayer was the only cure offered. He was told that he must have some serious spiritual problem for God to be so harshly dealing with him. He was not healed. He was taken to hospital eventually, but not before time. For this young man, that did not sustain his faith: it destroyed it.

AB was in Argentina in 1990, and fell acutely ill. The letters she had been assigned to read did not gain for her the requisite "victory". For the shepherds who cared for her that was an indication that she needed a sharp warning and needed to confess whatever terrible sin she was hiding. She was regarded as "rebellious" because she did not wish to eat. She was told Oplexicon, one of Satan's archangels, was living in her. She was barely 17 years old at the time and she was terrified. After many days of high fever and delirium she was finally taken to hospital and received emergency surgery which saved her life, but did not save her fallopian tubes. She was the victim of cruel neglect and those who had charge of her in the absence of her parents treated her with callous disregard for her welfare.

How did that happen? The answer is one which sends a shiver of apprehension down my spine. The answer is that her shepherds were conforming with the standards set by the leadership and were following their example. For them, AB was another MB. AB was ill in January 1990. In December 1989, the first issue of the new "Teen Specials" featuring a "Traumatic Testimony" was published as a warning to teenagers who like AB were:

"Wilfully yielding to the same spiritual sins that she (MB) yielded to such as extreme pride, self-righteousness, self-exultation and harsh criticism of others ... You can wind up in a living hell on earth like MB has experienced even within The Family if you yield to the Devil and his doubtful destructive and damning devices".

That letter was accompanied by "The last State" describing, as I shall do in a moment, how The Family dealt with MB and how her grandfather told her:

"You think you can invite these little devils to play around and cause trouble and all the rest but you can't stop, I want to tell you right now, not without suffering for it, not without paying for it! ... Those little dirty demons you've been inviting in to play around with and talk to you are not going to get away with it any more. Because they're going to lose their happy home in you, one way or the other."

What so concerns me is that here is another example of the letters influencing the conduct of the members and causing irreparable damage.

The treatment meted out to MB is so appalling that no one except perhaps DR had the gall to tempt to defend it. Mr Barton, labouring under the tremendous difficulty of coming so late into the case, did his best to cross examine MB and challenge her account of what had happened to her. The documents produced very much later in the case confirmed her evidence - indeed satisfied me that her evidence was restrained and understated rather than exaggerated. The letters are "The Last State" and the "Dangers of Demonism" published in March and July 1987. MB, born in June 1972, was invited to her grandfather's compound in December 1983, aged 11, left there in August 1987, aged 15 and left The Family for the United States in November 1990 aged 18. Sara wrote in "The Last State" letters:-

"How unbelievably good MB was in her overall behaviour, attitudes and even in spirit. There is no more extreme example we could use as an almost, nearly "perfect" child - the "best" we'd ever seen! We hardly could find any fault with her at all as MB was outwardly so very sweet, well behaved, submissive, yielded, very wise, very spiritual, mature and responsible and cooperative, just a real angel. Usually, when having to use such severe disciplinary measures as mentioned in the above letter, you're dealing with some incorrigible, defiant and rebellious teen terror or criminal, but this is not so in MB's case. She was always known and considered to be a very sweet and good girl."

Apparently her problem was being "seemingly too good". Sara recounted that it was not until they began to require a written daily report from the teens that they noted in MB's "Lesson and Trials" section that she repeatedly wrote "I need more love so I won't criticise others," or "I'm praying for more respect for my leadership."

Who could blame the girl for lacking respect for a man so revered by others when she knew from her personal knowledge that he was foul mouthed, drank too much and sexually abused her. For this she was brutally punished. Her crime was to have yielded to Satan. That led to a time of two months when she had five major exorcisms performed over her. She was subjected to total immersion in the Word, full-time, with top leadership "reading aloud along with her to keep her mind and mouth and eyes and ears occupied and for a constant infilling of the Holy Spirit." They prayed over her, even fifty times a day. She was 14 years old! She told me in her evidence that nearly ever word uttered by Berg was tape recorded. I thought at the time that it seemed rather fanciful. "The Last

State" letter GN278 written in August 1987, seems to be a transcript of recorded conversations and it constitutes a verbatim account of one of the exchanges between this vulnerable teenage girl and her grandfather. I am not surprised that the letter describes it as "the heaviest "strong meat" ever to be (published) and shared with our entire Family". The verbatim account was set out on 19 closely typed pages of which the following give the flavour:-

"Dad had been counselling some of The Family for several hours about being merciful and not being too hard on MB, and he called her in to gently try to talk to her and try to help her. But the Lord himself was obviously very upset with her as we were all soon to see!"

Then follows this account of the exorcism and I will quote the paragraph numbers to give some idea of its duration:-

"(29) MB comes in and Dad greets her with a loving kiss and embrace. "Praise the Lord, Honey, How are you? Bless and help her, Lord, as we talk to her about her problems, in Jesus' name. TYL" (Then, in a very loud voice:) "Hallelujah! Hallelujah! Hallelujah!" (Dad breaks into strong tongues for one full minute as he grabs MB with both hands and violently shakes her with every phrase that he shouts it!).

(30) Get out of here, Devil! Get out of her in Jesus' name! Get out of here! In the name of Jesus, get out of her! Hallelujah! In Jesus' name! I rebuke you, Satan! Look at me! Get out of there! (Slaps her face) Get out of there!...

(31) Do you hear me? (slaps) (MB: Yes sir!) Do you hear me? (MB: Yes sir!) Do you hear me? (MB: Yes sir!) Do you hear me? (MB: Yes sir!) Do you understand what I am talking about? (MB: Yes sir) That's what you're going to get if this thing comes back again! (Dad pushes MB into her chair.)

(32) I have heard too much of this thing! (Dad is gasping for breath with each phrase.)

(33) Do you know what they do with people in insane asylums that have devils and demons? Of course they don't call it that...

(35) God is angry! He is angry with you! I mean he is really angry! The power of God's spirit curse that devil and curse you for allowing him in...

(36) I've never put up with anything like this ever from the very first beginning of this Family, from my own first children, I have beaten them with the rod, I have beaten them until they cry for mercy...

(37) From now on I'm going to KNOCK the devil out of you if I have to...

(38) How can you my own granddaughter suppose to be one of my saved children, how could you invite Satan in and put curses on others, send little devils to other people? I don't ever want to hear about that again! (Slaps MB's face) Is that clear? (MB: Yes sir!)...

(39) Tonight you're going to go without your supper and you're going to fast and pray and pray with somebody every hour of the day and night until you get delivered and you don't let those god damn dirty slimy evil little things back into your mind! Is that clear? (Face to face with MB) (MB: Yes sir!) Or do I have to come over there and beat the devil out of you? huh! (MB: No)...

(42) From now on you're going to suffer corporal punishment! ...

(47) Your grandmother was insane, did you know that? I have just been giving them a long history of your background so they could have a little more sympathy and mercy on you and understand you came from a very seriously bad background. (Clears throat and spits.) Same to you, devil! Spit in his face! Do

you want me to spit in your face? If you manifest any more of these signs of devilry, I'm not only going to spit in your face, I'm going to hit you in your face!

(48) Has anybody ever punished you like that before? (MB: Yes) Who? (MB: "Uncle Peter".) (Peter Amsterdam: I spanked her once real hard.) Well, she undoubtedly needed it! (Maria: It wasn't anything like what you just gave her though.) When was this? (Peter: When we had prayer for her a while back.)

(49) I have a rod here, will you please bring it to me.. You see this? Pass it to her, let her feel it. I want you to feel this, how heavy it is. (Face to face with MB again.) That is a rod!

(50) I am going to take this rod to you and I am going to beat you with it the next time any of this stuff comes up.

(52) Do you want me to help you know what you're going to get? Come here, I'll let you feel it just one time. Bend over. (Spanks her!) Did you feel that? Well next time your buttocks are going to be bare and you're going to really feel it!

(53) You're dangerous you're going to go stark raving mad and do something terrible if you keep playing around with those devils.

(55) Your mother Shula's insane... Your father Aaron was insane! If it hadn't been for the Lord, he would have jumped off the cliff a long time before that...

(58) Do you want to be sane? (MB: Yes!)

(64) If you can't resist (the devil) then get rid of him yourself, wake up somebody that's with you and tell them to pray with you. And if they have to use a rod to beat him out of you, fine, you've got my permission. (Sara: Yes sir I'll do it!) If you've got to slap her to wake her up and get her out of that kind of spirit, slap her! Slap her good! Knock her around! Let her have it! ...

(74) Now get out, you damn devil, and leave her alone, or I'm going to whack the daylights out of her! (She cries.) Thank God that's the first time I think I've seen tears! Are you sorry? (MB: Yes sir!) But if you're not sorry, I'm going to make you sorry!...

(81) You think you're going to make it up there (in the system) somehow? The only way you could make it is to be a whore, that's all! You wouldn't even be an FFer, you wouldn't even be doing it for God, you'd just be doing it for a living. You'd probably end up on drugs - a drug demon possessed, alcoholic, diseased whore and soon dead! Now is that what you want? (MB: No sir!)...

(88) I don't know whether these here have ever seen me this angry before, and I'm sure you've never seen me this angry before, but there are some others who have! There are some others I have knocked around and slapped down for being so full of the devil and playing around with Satan and toying with demons! I kicked some of them out of The Family...

(90) You're dirty, you're filthy, you stink! Your self righteousness pride stinks worst of all, like stinking dirty menstuous rags! ... And we're not going to stand the stench of it any more, is that clear?

(93) We have spent too many hours putting up with this problem, too many days, too many weeks, too many months.

(106) As far as I'm concerned your father Aaron died failing God. ... Do you want to die like that knowing you failed God and you disobeyed and hurt your family, your grandfather your father your foster father all of us? (MB: No sir!).

(113) I was practically screaming in tongues, I think I'm hoarse from it now.

(114) The Lord took hold of her head" (referring to the events set out in para. 29) "and yanked it around and back and

forth and side ways to side ways by my hands until I was afraid I was going to yank her head off or break her neck! God was so angry... And then I hauled off and slapped her I don't know how many times tonight, hard, right? (MB: Yes sir!) And hit you....

(145) If you go back into that foolishness again, these folks have got my permission to slap you around and knock you around, if they have to knock you out to get rid of that! Because you have got to want to get rid of it, and if it takes a good beating up to make you want to get rid of it, then we're going to beat you up!...

(170) My God, MB, how could you think you could get way with it? How could you not fear God? How did you think you could get away from the wrath of God? I represent God to you... He nearly yanked your head off here! That was the Lord! I didn't plan that, I had no idea. I'm almost horrified to think back at what happened, but it was God! You heard the voice of the Lord bawling you and those dirty little demons out and threatening to take your head off if you didn't stop it!

(183) The last resort we now have is to beat you with the rod until it really hurts and you don't want it any more! Right? (MB: Yes sir!) But if that doesn't work then what can we do? We can't kill you, that's God's business. We'll have to get rid of you. Now that's the facts.

(185) Nobody wants to sleep with you, they're actually afraid of you because you've been under the control of the Devil...

(186) So we can't trust you any more not even after all this tonight...

(188) Now that's the picture I got while we were praying, that they're going to restrain you. We're going to punish you! You're not going to get away with this. God has put us here as parents to punish you when you do evil and you've been doing the vilest kind of evil, the worst kind of sin.

(189) I suggest you tie her to the bed.

(190) Make sure she goes to the toilet the very last thing. I don't care if you wet the bed, dear, your hands are going to be tied to the sides of that bed at night when the others are trying to sleep. Are you willing to submit to that? (MB: Yes!) If you have cotton or cloth ropes, that's the best thing.

(191) Think of it, you've gotten to the state where nobody can trust you and they're afraid you might do them or yourself harm! You the great MB who was a great singer and so vaunted in her pride, in her talent, in her singing and world famous has gotten so full of the Devil we have to tie her down at night and threaten to beat her up in the daytime if she doesn't behave.

(194) If beating doesn't get the hell out of you, you're going to get the hell out of here: I want you to memorise that. (MB: If beating you doesn't get the hell out of you, you're going to get the hell out of here!)

(196) So for a peaceful night's rest I suggest you tie her hands to the bed... Don't tie it so tight she can't move, just tight enough that she can't reach herself and she can't squirm out of it.

(197) This is the first time we've ever done that that I know of, but that's the picture God gave me, and if I follow God's pictures, ..., it never fails.

(198) So your first punishment was what God gave you tonight, and what I gave you, a good slapping around to knock that hell out of you, and just gave you one lick and felt like giving you more with this stick! And if we have any more trouble, you're going to get more of it, from anyone of these here that are authorised to do it.

(197) She's not to be alone at any time from now on. Someone is to be with her at all times who is big and strong and spiritual enough that you just absolutely knock it out of her.

(206) My God help her to realise how awful and how horrible this is, that she can never ever again claim any kind of righteousness of herself. She has been one of the most wicked persons we have ever had in this Family, one of the most evil one of the most dangerous so that we have to tie her up at night to make sure she doesn't do anybody any damage. We have to divorce her from our quarters, from our arms, from our children, and put her in virtual incarceration at least at night. She has to have a guard with her all day long to make sure that she behaves until we are sure she is cured.

(215) If you don't get rid of those demons you may have to get whipped in bed caned in bed.

(243) I love you sweetheart. Goodnight." I regard this as vicious treatment of a vulnerable child. Saying, "I love you sweetheart", does not redress the wrong done to her. She was physically ill-treated; and she was emotionally ill-treated; she was put in fear; she was humiliated; her self-esteem was denigrated. Maria and Peter stood by and watched it happen and approved of what was happening. They showed little more sensitivity and insight than their at times demented leader. I cannot accept that this was, in any sense at all, a cure for the emotional problems from which the child was undoubtedly suffering. The Traumatic Testimony letter gave The Family's diagnosis of her problem:-

"You're going to go completely nuts. In fact they say you've already gone completely nuts, you're already insane, totally non compos mentis! Totally incapacitated and mentally not sane at all."

About a year later MB was sent to the detention camp in Macau. It is not now disputed that she did there suffer a complete mental breakdown and that she required but did not at first receive appropriate psychiatric help. Eventually after tribulations which I shall later set out, she was finally sent for proper treatment. From there she was sent back to the United States in America. She again broke down and underwent more psychiatric treatment. Unfortunately I do not have full medical reports on her condition.

Doctor Cameron, a Consultant Child Psychiatrist, gave evidence to me. He told me, and I accept, that the treatment meted out to MB was totally unacceptable. This was a child caught in the conflict between what she saw and what had happened to her, which she knew to be wrong but which she had been taught to accept as right. Disillusioned and depressed, she doubted. If, as happened to MB, a significant cause of a mental or nervous breakdown is the feeling that one is lacking in trust or faith, and the treatment prescribed is to hammer home what a worthless sinner one is, then the treatment enhances the self-doubt, and the very treatment itself becomes damaging and psychologically disabling. This is an extract from MB's own evidence as I noted it:-

"I upset them when 13/14 because I began to realise grandfather was a hypocrite who made rules for people which were not necessary for him. He would write one thing one day the opposite the next because God was changing. He was very contradictory. He was a chronic alcoholic. It was very confusing. When he was sick he would drink and call different women in for sexual relations or sexual comfort. It was very difficult to respect this man when he was so drunk. I now look back at his writings as the ravings of a drunk madman. Another thing that upset me at 14 was that I was losing my faith in the group and in the prophet - all the things I believed in. I had violent pictures and images and they said that showed I was listening to Satan. They would say that Satan and demons were attacking me. I do not know if it was my imagination but I was

seeing demons. In bed I would get out terrified because I thought the spirits would attack me sexually. I would try to cover myself up. I would confess to Sara, my stepfather, Faithy and others because I was afraid of Satan and wanted to be right with God and wanted the group's approval. They would slap me. Later they gathered the leadership together, pulled my pants down and spanked me publicly which was humiliating because these people were important to me. Six months later when my grandfather was told, he commanded them to beat me with his rod whenever I had violent thoughts or saw monsters.... Many times they would beat me, they took my head and beat it against the wall and bruised me. I was helpless and knew nothing else. My stepfather spanked me with his hands. It all felt like torture and once I fainted, throwing up. They said I was throwing up demons. The exorcising terrified me". Later I was able to compare that description with The Family's description of MB in Macau taken from her Traumatic Testimony:-

"This is the story of MB, who made a conscious effort to entertain the Devil and his lies and whose former fascination for evil has now left her spiritually and mentally handicapped. Of course, Dad and others warned her time and time again that the Devil was going to drive her insane if she didn't make a positive stand against the lies of the enemy and stop yielding to the devilry she was so fascinated with as you can read in the letters the "Last State" and "Its up to You". The prophetic warnings of those letters have been fulfilled as is proven in the following pitiful and revealing report written by MB's present shepherds" (in December 1989). "What started out as a little mind-game developed into absolute obsession and eventually resulted in a very unstable, feeble and virtually insane mind. ... She cannot take any kind of stressful situation and is very easily scared and affected by any attacks of the Enemy. ... She is definitely feeble-minded as Grandpa said. It's hard for her to concentrate, and she has a hard time making sense when she talks and often is unable to finish a sentence that she has started. She cannot take care of herself like a normal person, spiritually or even in many ways physically. ... She still gets seriously attacked with bad violent pictures sometimes... May this be a warning to others who feel they can dabble with the Enemy! MB thought it was just a little disobedience and that she was only being a little bit rebellious and only wanted to do that for a little while. But the effects in her life are long lasting and so extensive that it will probably take a lifetime to undo the damage and for her to gain lasting victories over the things that hinder and negatively affect her. MB can still work, she does her daily jobs but she is not normal. It takes MB a lot longer to do things than normal people. She is making progress but we have to work with her daily on this because she isn't "all there" sometimes, when we give her instructions, we have to repeat them over and over again. How different from the very clever, sharp and quick witted girl she once was. She now does not really understand the first time or the second time or in many cases the third time. It is very sad! She isn't sharp, she is very dull and doesn't have all her wits about her. She spaces out often in classes, it's very difficult for her to tune in. MB is still sick, she is still recovering from the extensive damage that the Enemy has done to her. She has developed some strange mannerisms. For example when she is nervous or begins to get negative thoughts from the Enemy, she starts picking her hair out, to the point that she even has a bald spot! She scrapes her lip with her fingernail in a weird nervous fashion and other times begins to uncontrollably scratch herself almost like a monkey. She often has black bags under her eyes from worry. So much worrying

causes her to have stomach problems which in turn cause her to have very bad breath. She doesn't sleep well, her sleep is often interrupted because she is unable to relax ... So as you can see from this report, MB still has very serious problems, and in the system's eyes she would be considered insane and without a doubt she would be locked up in a mental institution. Thank the Lord for the love and mercy of God and Grandpa who have allowed her to be in one of our Family homes where she can partake of God's spirit which has been slowly cleansing her from these inroads of the enemy which she brought upon herself."

There is an affidavit from KG, who did not attend for cross examination, who takes up the sad story.

"After our daily taking care of the said MB for 31/2 years, rather than improving and normalising as we had so hoped, regrettably she regressed into a sad state of hysteria, and frenzy, to the point that she had to be daily spoon-fed her meals - only to have her wilfully regurgitate her food after hours of struggling to help her eat. She began to have no control over her bladder and bowel movements and became incontinent. She was pulling her hair out by the handful, laying all over the house, on tables etc. and would frequently disrobe in public. She began running around the house threatening to harm myself or my husband if we failed to control her in any way, throwing articles of clothing out of the window and screaming profanities at the top of her lungs. This extreme display of insanity was causing hours and hours of our time and care to the point that we finally had make a decision to have her committed into the care of the Macau Government Centro Mental Hospital. This was on or about September or October 1990."

I have perhaps dealt with MB at inordinate length. I do so because of the central role she plays not only in The Family's past but in its present. For The Family to gain the respectability which they now appear to seek, they must acknowledge that what David Berg did to his granddaughter was wrong, not just a mistake, but inexcusably wrong. They must atone for their treatment of her which I find to have been barbaric and cruel.

My duty now is to set aside that sense of revulsion and concentrate on S and his medical care. I am totally satisfied that in the care of his mother he has received all appropriate medical attention. He was born in hospital and his mother duly registered him with general practitioners both in London and in the country. The health visitors visit. He has been immunised. When he needs medical care, he gets it. Mother herself took ill during the course of the trial and immediately sought medical help for herself. None of the members of The Family who are close to S gave any hint of their unwillingness to seek proper medical attention. There was no evidence of any extreme belief in illness being God's punishment. There was no evidence of any extreme belief that prayer was the only relief against being ill. S has been properly cared for, and I have total confidence in this mother to continue properly to care for him and I fear no medical neglect at her hands.

Mother and the community at the Ward's home may receive a clean bill of health but The Family's history leaves me with festering doubts about the organisation and its order of medical priorities and accordingly I must take into account some risk to S if he were to be separated from his mother and fall into the wrong hands.

IMPAIRMENT OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Berg's early aspirations for the movement were set out in his letter "New Bottles" in June 1973. He remarked:-

"Do you realise we are now producing another generation. A new more revolutionary generation? They are

going to be I hope the purest generation of all, totally revolutionary from the very beginning. The little ones being born will never have known anything but our kind of life! I'm hoping that these little children are going to be really pure revolutionaries from birth, and so far it looks like they are! Your children will be totally revolutionary, never knowing what churchianity and system jobs and education are like!" To achieve that ideal it was, of course, necessary carefully to control what was poured into these new bottles. That degree of control was imposed, for example, by the letter "You are what you read" in August 1978. The text books Berg "had to wade through" in college were denounced as "ridiculous", "full of the lies and distortions of men":-

"Those books are written with the demonic satanic wisdom of the Devil himself! Cunningly devised to deceive you and lead you astray and twist you spiritually to where you don't know what is true. ... Nearly everything you have to know is in the Bible, except perhaps current events, recent revelations and a few other things."

In August 1978 he returned to the theme in "Book Burning - You are What You Read" and informed the members that:-

"I don't want to hear that anybody in this outfit is reading anything but your Bible or the Letters or some books that you have been assigned to read for a good purpose." By 1985, The Family were having to get to know the fruits of their education policies. In the "History of The Family" produced by SPM, WS wrote:

"Many of the couples who had married during the early years of the Children of God era had adolescent children and, as is natural at that age, those young teenagers were encountering serious questions about life and the world around them as they searched for their identities and that, of course, held new challenges for Family parents."

The Searcher's mission discovered a large number of disillusioned teenagers for whom the Teen Training Camp was held in Mexico in 1986 when:

"These young people were challenged to renew their relationship with the Lord, and to give their lives to him again. ... Many of them chose to become teen missionaries and obtain permission from their parents to move on to the mission fields of Latin America after the TTC".

Following the Mexico TTC, similar teen training camps were held in other major mission fields, primarily in South America and the Far East. At the Japan TTC they had "desperate prayer and laying on of hands for deliverance and prayed individually" for each of a number specific requests including:-

"Against system influenced through books,
Against the influence of system schools"

In August 1988 Berg had "the School Vision" which was "God's answer to our child crisis." By then the Heavenly City School had begun to operate from Tateyama in Japan. This example of a large school for the education of the children was attractive. As Berg acknowledged:-

"The education of our children is already getting to be a monumental thing, a desperate need, really, because most of our parents don't feel very qualified to teach their children. They never had much education or any degrees or any of that sort of thing, and they don't really feel qualified. I guess that most of them feel like they really haven't done too good a job on their kids when they've had to be so busy doing other things, the Lord's work, therefore their kids haven't really gotten a very good education... So I think a lot of parents, although they'd miss them, would really feel relieved that their kids were at least

going to get a thorough education in the subjects that we consider important - not a broad public school type of education, but a really serious Family education in the 3 R's, plus Bible. ... Just educating our children for the Lord's work has become one of our major ministries. We're not just educating them for the sake of education. We simply want to give them enough education so they'll be able to face without fear any worldling, and have sufficient knowledge not to be ashamed of their ignorance, and to at least a better comprehension of the world than most of the systemites have now. As I've often said, they certainly need to know how to read and write and figure, and then have a general grasp of world history. I think we've given them a pretty good grasp of world history just from Bible history and prophecy. Education of our children for the Lord's service is becoming a serious emergency. ... Remember, we are not training just for now till the Lord comes, what little time we have left here, we're training for the future. ... We have had so many children now, they've almost become our biggest job! And properly to take care of them and train them - the best and most potential disciples we could possibly have - is a very important job and ministry... They could, in time, win a lot more souls and train a lot more workers than if we just kept on winning disciples."

Berg was recognising that the large proportion of children in The Family was presenting them with a crisis. Were they to use the children to be out on the streets with the parents selling tapes and posters - which neglected their training (he did not like to use the word "education") - or were they to recognise that caring for this large mass of children was more important than having everyone on the streets witnessing? It was a challenging question to which The Family responded by tending either to open schools or to gather the children from several homes together to form a school home. The Family's educational curriculum was strengthened by the introduction of a new uniform Home Schooling Programme. The children were marked and assessed and records kept of their progress and this had the great advantage of enabling children to move from home to home, indeed from country to country whilst still maintaining uniformity of approach.

Bringing teenage children together inevitably led to some of the disaffected sowing the seeds of dissension. To contain it, The Family established a series of "Victor Programmes", about which I must later deal specifically.

The problems being experienced by the young continued to demand much of The Family's attention. In 1990, Maria had to acknowledge "the trials and difficulties" that her 11 year old daughter Techii had been going through and these together with "the keys to helping her overcome them" were published in the "Techii Series." As things got worse and worse with Techii, Maria began to feel:-

"The whole Family is now in a very similar stage with their Jetts and teens. You may have been able to commit the care of your children to other teachers, helpers and overseers, and in many cases, you've virtually had to do that in order to fulfil the different ministries to which the Lord has called you. And in some cases you're still not going to be able to spend very much time with your children because for the Lord's work's sake you have to either be apart from them or devote most of your time and energies to other responsibilities and ministries." Her response to the dilemma was:-

"If we want to avoid having all our Jetts and teens becoming dissatisfied, confused and rebellious "problem cases", I think we're going to have to re-evaluate our entire structure, and consider re-vamping and overhauling our entire present